



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 2004

No. 51

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 20, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Under Your Divine Providence, this Nation was established and has been guided through the years. Through turmoil, strife, disasters, and even wars, You have brought Your people to renewed faith, greater strength, and a deeper longing for peace.

Be with us now. Protect our Armed Forces wherever they may be. Confirm their families in Your love. Guide and enable the Members of Congress today as they take up the Nation's business and seek to protect and defend its people.

Through suffering and death, bring forth new life and true freedom by Your almighty power, Lord God, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BEREUTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 129. An act to provide for reform relating to Federal employment, and for other purposes.

S. 1108. An act to establish within the National Park Service the 225th Anniversary of the American Revolution Commemorative Program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 108-173, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on Systemic Interoperability:

Frederick W. Slunecka, of South Dakota.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-201, as amended by Public Law 105-275, the Chair, on behalf of President pro tempore, appoints the following individuals as members of the Board of Trustees of American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress:

Mickey Hart of California, and
Dennis Holub of South Dakota.

The message also announced that pursuant title VI, section 637 of Public Law 108-199, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Helping to Enhance the Liveli-

hood of People (HELP) Around the Globe Commission:

Steven K. Berry of Washington, DC.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 108-199, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment made during the adjournment of Douglas G. Ohmer of South Dakota to serve as a member of the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program on April 14, 2004.

CONTINUITY OF GOVERNMENT

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, before I start my remarks, I was just moved by the prayer by the chaplain, and I hope everyone hearing our voice and through the miracle of television can pick that up on the Web site and read it once again because it is a prayer that the American people need to focus on and take to heart.

Mr. Speaker, by taking up the Continuity in Representation Act this week, the House will not only address a glaring deficiency in Federal law, it will also make an unequivocal statement about America's national resolve on the war on terror.

None of us in this Chamber or in this Nation wants to think of a scenario that would compel the Speaker to invoke this legislation, but such are the responsibilities of leadership in the post-9/11 world.

The bill will therefore put in place a process by which Congress can quickly reconstitute itself after a catastrophic event. If such an event occurs and an extreme number of resulting vacancies threaten the continuity of congressional activity, the Speaker may, under this legislation, order States to call special elections to fill those vacancies within 45 days.

By passing this legislation, we will guarantee the failure of any terrorist

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2157

attempt to decapitate the legislative branch of the United States Government. But just as importantly, the vote this week will show our Nation and our enemies two things: our unity and our resolve. The Continuity in Representation Act has bipartisan support thanks to the long and tireless work of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. And despite our policy differences, everyone on both sides of the aisle can plainly see the need that this bill meets; and everyone has come to this issue, even in an election year, with sincerity and patriotism.

Many believe that bipartisanship disappears whenever the calendar year ends with an even number, but this issue and this bill disprove that cynical assumption.

The vote this week will also affirm once again our national commitment to victory in the war on terror. Our prosecution of this war must be relentless and comprehensive. On the battlefield we have to continue to take the war to the terrorists. And here at home we have to maintain a united front and advance every policy we can to support our troops and discourage our enemies.

So with this legislation that we pass this week, the House will send a very clear message to those enemies that no amount of violence that they hope to visit upon us will interrupt the continuity of our national service.

CYPRUS

(Mr. BEREUTER. asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, last summer this House overwhelmingly adopted a resolution calling on the citizens of Cyprus to accept a U.N.-sponsored plan designed to end 29 years of separation and to unite the island. During the floor debate, this Member expressed the sincere hope that in 2004 we would be celebrating the first anniversary of a united Cyprus, not the 30th anniversary of a divided one.

Regrettably, this hope may not be realized. Although the U.N. plan is scheduled to be voted on in a referendum on April 24, the recent very disappointing decision by the president of Cyprus to recommend a "no" vote to Cypriots may have doomed the best chance to reunify that country in a very long time.

Turkish Cypriots today appear to be strongly in favor of the referendum, and Ankara has played a most positive role in moving the process forward. Both should be commended for their actions and resolve.

It is unfortunate that, in a reversal of positions, it may now be the Greek Cypriots who will block unification.

In Athens it is believed that both the current government and the opposition remain supportive of the U.N. plan. A strong public statement of support

from Athens would be very helpful in this critical time.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, this Member believes there is still a chance that Cyprus may enter the EU on May 1 as a united country. The U.S. has pledged \$400 million to help implement the U.N. plan. To the Cypriots, I say do the right thing for their own sake.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO WILLIE VAUGHN

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th birthday of my uncle who lives in St. Louis, Missouri; and I guess on May 1 hundreds of my relatives are going to converge on that city to pay tribute to him. So I simply rise to wish a happy birthday to "Uncle Dude," as we finally called him. His name is Willie Vaughn. But he has lived a long and productive life. His mind is great. He is still active. Happy birthday to Uncle Dude.

FIGHTING THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this month I served on a bipartisan delegation led by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) to visit Iraq. But I found every stop in Qatar, Iraq, Jordan, and Hungary to be a crucial part of the global war on terror. I saw first-hand courageous coalition forces of dozens of nations working with determination to stop terrorism from destroying modern civilization.

As evidenced by another bombing in Madrid, while terrorist cells with truckloads of explosives were arrested in England and Jordan, this is truly a worldwide conflict, not solely in Iraq.

Despite the renewed violence, we found troop morale high. Incredibly, the South Carolina troops who walk the streets said 90 percent of the Iraqis were grateful for liberation.

September 11 confirmed we are in a global war we did not seek. We must confront the terrorists overseas where they train, or we will fight them in America at our homes. From Qatar to Iraq to Jordan to Hungary, competent and dedicated patriots are making a difference.

In conclusion, may God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

A MESSAGE OF GRATITUDE FROM IRAQIS

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is said that a picture is worth a thousand words. And yesterday this photograph was taken by a UPI photographer, remarkably, on the streets of Fallujah in Iraq. It depicts the gratitude of an ordinary Iraqi to a United States Marine who, along with many Marines and constituents of mine from Indiana, are patrolling the streets of that war-torn city at this very hour.

I bring this photograph because in the midst of the heartbreak of the loss of American soldiers over the past several weeks, some say this means that the Iraqi people do not want us there, that they fail to appreciate the sacrifices that we have made in the blood of our countrymen.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not what I saw when I was in Iraq a month ago, in Basra and in Baghdad. The Iraqis with whom I met spoke with passion and emotion the same message depicted in this picture: a message of gratitude to the American soldier, gratitude to the American people, not only for ending the reign of Saddam Hussein but for staying the course and seeing them through to freedom. And as the President said, in the interest of these good people, these soldiers and this country will not waver.

A CALL FOR HEARINGS ON THE WAR IN IRAQ

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we now know the truth was the first casualty of the President's war in Iraq. Ironically, the truth was not shot down by a cruise missile but by the Commander in Chief.

Instead of openly telling Congress and the American people that he wanted to take out Saddam, the President secretly diverted \$700 million from the war in Afghanistan to prepare for the invasion in Iraq without telling the Congress, \$700 million meant to help find and deal with Osama bin Laden on behalf of the 9/11 victims, on behalf of America.

Another Republican in the White House the last time America faced this secrecy was Richard Nixon, whose legacy is a profound mistrust in government that lingers to this day.

Just as America did 3 decades ago, it is time to shine the bright light of an open and democratic society on what the administration did. I call on the Speaker and the Congress to hold hearings, just as America did during Watergate, to get to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the President's war in Iraq.

□ 1415

WE HAD OSAMA BIN LADEN IN
OUR SIGHTS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of the year 2000, a Predator drone captured Osama bin Laden on tape. At that time, the Predator could not be armed.

But the tape is revealing. It was relayed in real time to CIA headquarters, and the CIA was watching bin Laden as he moved, when he moved. The tape proves that the Clinton administration had bin Laden in its sights, as it did several times during its 8 years in office, but did nothing.

A former CIA station chief in Afghanistan said that the Clinton White House issued an ultimatum to the CIA, "Capture bin Laden, don't kill him." They wanted to arrest bin Laden and send him to court. Unfortunately, since then we have learned that you cannot fight terrorism by filing legal papers.

We cannot hesitate to act in defense of our national interests, even if that means acting alone or acting preemptively. We cannot wait for appropriate international committees to give us permission.

Our national security is far too important to be left to the whims of world opinion, and it is far too important to wait for legal papers to be filed.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF AL-
FRED MANSOUR OF LAGRANGE,
GEORGIA

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to celebrate the life of a great Georgia citizen. Alfred Mansour of LaGrange, Georgia, passed away April 17, 2004. He was a great example of how love for church, family and business can unify, strengthen and better an entire community.

Alfred Mansour was a man of family and faith who lived a life of service to his community. In the business world, Alfred Mansour was the first president of Mansour's, Incorporated, which included his family's business, Mansour's Department Store, a cornerstone of the LaGrange business community.

After serving his country during World War II, Mr. Mansour returned to LaGrange as a community leader, a loving husband, and a devoted father of five children. He was a member of the St. Peter's Catholic Church, where I have had the opportunity to worship with him and his wife Nini. He was a Member of the Knights of Columbus, a past president of LaGrange Lions Club, a founding member of the Chattahoochee Valley Art Association, a member of the LaGrange/Troup County Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Highland Country Club.

Friends and those who knew him described Alfred Mansour as a humble man of God and an astute businessman. Most importantly, those who loved him as a husband and a father, Nini and children Priscilla, Martha, Rita, Fred and Larry, knew him as a man of unrelenting love and passion.

Indeed, Alfred Mansour will be so missed for his service to God, family and community.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 5, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 5, 2004 at 1:50 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 404.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

MARJORIE C. KELAHER
(For Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2 (h) of Rule II of the rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 8, 2004 at 3:50 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to conference report H.R. 3108.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAH, L.
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, Speaker Pro Tempore WOLF signed the following enrolled bill on Friday, April 9, 2004:

H.R. 3108, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily replace the 30-year Treasury rate with a rate based on long-term corporate bonds for certain pension plan funding requirements and other provisions, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON.
NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC
LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to (10 U.S.C. 111 note) I hereby appoint Mr. Keith Martin of Shavertown, Pennsylvania, to the Commission on the Review of the Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLA-
TIVE DIRECTOR OF HON. J. DEN-
NIS HASTERT, MEMBER OF CON-
GRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Anthony Reed, Legislative Director of the Honorable J. DENNIS HASTERT, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 19, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY REED,
Legislative Director.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

RECORD votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

RICHARD G. WILSON PROCESSING
AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4037) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 475 Kell Farm Drive in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the "Richard G. Wilson Processing and Distribution Facility".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4037

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RICHARD G. WILSON PROCESSING AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 475 Kell Farm Drive in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Richard G. Wilson Processing and Distribution Facility".

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Richard G. Wilson Processing and Distribution Facility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4037.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, I rise in support of H.R. 4037, which honors the life of Richard G. Wilson by naming this U.S. Postal Service processing and distribution facility in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, after him.

Private First Class Wilson was an Army corpsman who served with gallantry during the Korean War. He distinguished himself by aiding wounded soldiers in harm's way outside Opari, Korea, in October of 1950.

At the bottom of the valley near Opari, enemy forces engaged Private Wilson's company. As the U.S. forces suffered casualties, the unarmed Private Wilson charged into harsh combat to provide aid to his wounded company men, despite their protest. He treated several soldiers in the face of the merciless enemy attack.

The company was forced to retreat, and Private Wilson's whereabouts were initially unknown. Two days later, a U.S. patrol found him lying next to one of the troops that he had helped during the firefight. Wilson had been shot several times.

Private Wilson was posthumously awarded the Nation's highest military award for valor, the Congressional Medal of Honor, on June 21, 1951. The medal was presented to Wilson's widow Yvonna in a ceremony at the Pentagon that day.

Mr. Speaker, this postal facility designation, introduced by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), will memorialize Richard Wilson's bravery and selflessness in his hometown of Cape Girardeau, Missouri. I understand that members of his family still live in Cape Girardeau, and I cer-

tainly hope this exceedingly deserved honor for Richard Wilson will be meaningful to them.

Mr. Speaker, while heroes of today fight for freedom across the globe in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, it is always appropriate to recognize America's military heroes of yesterday. I strongly urge every Member of the House to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 4037, legislation naming a postal facility in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, after Richard G. Wilson. This measure was introduced by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) on March 25, 2004, and unanimously reported by our committee on April 1, 2004. It enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Missouri delegation.

Mr. Speaker, Richard G. Wilson, Private First Class, United States Army, was attached to Medical Company 1 of the 187th Airborne Infantry Regiment and served in the Korean War. According to military accounts, Pfc. Wilson distinguished himself by "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action."

As a medic, he accompanied his unit in Opari, Korea, administering medical attention to his wounded comrades in the midst of fierce enemy fighting. After his unit was forced to withdraw from the area, Pfc. Wilson moved his wounded colleagues to safety and searched to make sure that no man was left behind.

After realizing that one soldier was missing, Pfc. Wilson returned to the area in search of his colleague. Pfc. Wilson was found 2 days later lying beside the man he had been searching for. For his bravery, courage and self-sacrifice for his comrades, he was posthumously awarded the Nation's highest award for valor, the Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for seeking to honor the legacy of Richard Wilson by naming a postal facility in his name in his hometown of Cape Girardeau, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like very much to thank my colleagues from the Committee on Government Reform for so swiftly passing this very important bill out of the committee. I know that the family of Private First Class Wilson is very proud at this moment, and will be even prouder when we pass this bill later today.

I do have the honor, Mr. Speaker, to speak on behalf of this bill to honor a true American hero from the district I represented in southern Missouri.

H.R. 4037 would dedicate the Cape Girardeau Processing and Distribution Facility for mail to hometown and American hero Private First Class Richard G. Wilson. I know that my other colleagues who have spoken have mentioned some of the important things that Private First Class Wilson did, but I would like to mention them once again.

Private First Class Wilson joined thousands of courageous soldiers who fought in the Korean War when he enlisted in the United States Army and became part of Company 1, Medical Company, 187th Airborne Infantry Regiment.

As a U.S. Army medic in active combat during the Korean War at the age of 19, Private First Class Wilson accompanied his unit during a reconnaissance mission through Opari in Korea. When the troops were ambushed in a narrow valley, Pfc. Wilson administered aid to his wounded comrades. Even though his company commander ordered the unit to move out, Pfc. Wilson returned to the field of battle to rescue a soldier who was left for dead, but was attempting to crawl to safety. Private First Class Wilson was unarmed, but that did not deter him from his mission.

Two days later, Private First Class Wilson was found dead beside the man he gave his life trying to save. This is an example of the superb bravery that reflects Richard Wilson's character and so rightly earned him the Nation's highest military award, the Medal of Honor.

In 1951, the Medal of Honor was awarded to Richard G. Wilson's widow, Yvonna Wilson, at the Pentagon. Today she and hundreds of Cape Girardeau residents remember and honor Pfc. Wilson's bravery and commitment to our country. It is very appropriate his memory become a prominent part of our community.

Naming the postal facility after Pfc. Wilson will serve as a lasting testament of our gratitude to him for his brave example, just as we are proud of all men and women from southern Missouri and around the country who have served our country so honorably.

Richard Wilson exemplifies the valor of so many men and women who have served our Nation in uniform. This simple reminder of his brave actions will stand as a testament in Cape Girardeau that we respect his sacrifice, but it also will signal that we wish him to serve as an example for generations of Americans to come. With this designation we claim him for our own and honor his memory.

Our definition of the word "hero" has changed many times over the years. Private First Class Wilson, however, is a hero for any era.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 4037.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4037.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1430

GENERAL JOHN J. PERSHING POST OFFICE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3855) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 607 Pershing Drive in Laclede, Missouri, as the "General John J. Pershing Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3855

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 607 Pershing Drive in Laclede, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "General John J. Pershing Post Office".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the General John J. Pershing Post Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3855, which honors one of our

Nation's greatest patriots and champions of freedom, General John Joseph Pershing. This legislation designates the U.S. Postal Service facility in Laclede, Missouri, as the General John J. Pershing Post Office.

John Joseph Pershing was born on September 13, 1860, in Linn County, Missouri. As a teenager, Pershing became a teacher at a school for African American children in Laclede. While later teaching at Prairie Mound, he entered and won a competitive examination for an appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point, enrolling in 1882.

Pershing was only average in his studies at West Point, but he excelled in leadership roles and displayed extraordinary soldierly qualities. Pershing held the highest possible rank in the Cadet Battalion each year; and in 1886 he was elected president of his class, and he graduated as senior cadet captain, the highest honor at West Point.

Mr. Speaker, General Pershing worked his entire life to protect and preserve freedom. His nickname, Black Jack, dates from his service with the 10th Cavalry, a unit of the Buffalo Soldiers in Montana. It became a subtle accolade to both him and the Buffalo Soldiers he fought with and praised. Pershing took the nickname with pride as an honor to the soldiers that he fought with. He was concerned about the welfare of all soldiers, especially minorities; and as a result of his service in the 10th Cavalry, Pershing remained instrumental in coordinating minority organizations throughout his entire military career.

Mr. Speaker, General Pershing was a man who consistently praised his soldiers and understood their commitments to freedom and to this great Nation. Despite his numerous awards and honors, General Pershing was a man of humility.

He was promoted to brigadier general in 1906 over 862 senior officers. As a major general, Pershing was appointed commander of the American Expeditionary Forces following the U.S. declaration of war against Germany.

The Regular Army at that time consisted of only 25,000 men, and there was no reserve core as we know it today. General Pershing literally organized an army from scratch. And within a year and a half, the national Army consisted of approximately 2.5 million men, a result of recruiting and training programs initiated by Pershing. These same programs stood as a model for the mobilization training plan of World War II.

Following the Great War, General Pershing became chief of staff to the U.S. Army in 1921. Up until his death, he worked to ensure American forces were prepared in a changing global environment. He was truly ahead of his time as our Nation came to realize our importance on the global stage.

Mr. Speaker, General Pershing's service to this country in World War I

was so phenomenal that the 66th Congress revived the rank called the General of the Armies of the United States. General Pershing was appointed to that office on September 3, 1919. He accepted the appointment on September 8 of that year and retired with that rank on his birthday in 1924.

General Pershing passed away on July 15, 1948, at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington D.C. He was a great American. He stands as an inspiration to all those who have served this great Nation in our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Missouri for honoring General Pershing. This post office will stand as a testament to his dedication to freedom and as a permanent token of appreciation from a grateful Nation. I encourage all Members of the House to support H.R. 3855.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 3855, legislation naming a postal facility in Laclede, Missouri, after General John J. "Blackjack" Pershing. This measure, which was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) on February 26, 2004, and unanimously reported by our committee on March 4, 2004, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Missouri delegation.

John Pershing was born in a small town in Missouri in 1860. He graduated from West Point and served in the Spanish-American War, the Philippines Insurrection, the Mexican Expedition, and was the overall American commander in Europe during World War I.

Long on experience and recognized as a celebrated hero and soldier, the United States Congress honored John Pershing by creating a new title, General of the Armies. And following the war, he served as Army chief of staff.

General Pershing died in Washington D.C. at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. His funeral, held at the Memorial Amphitheater in Arlington National Cemetery, was attended by thousands of Americans as well as leaders of government and the military. He was buried according to his wishes, under a simple white grave stone in section 34 near the grave sites of his Doughboys from World War I.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a fitting honor to name the postal facility in Missouri after General Pershing, especially one who was so celebrated for his great courage, exceptional ability, and the ability to command troops from different races and backgrounds at a time unheard of.

I support this resolution and urge its swift passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman

from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 3855, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3855.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DOSAN AHN CHANG HO POST OFFICE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1822) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3751 West 6th Street in Los Angeles, California, as the "Dosan Ahn Chang Ho Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1822

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DOSAN AHN CHANG HO POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3751 West 6th Street in Los Angeles, California, shall be known and designated as the "Dosan Ahn Chang Ho Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Dosan Ahn Chang Ho Post Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I rise today in support of H.R. 1822. This post office designation introduced by the distinguished gentlewoman from

California (Ms. WATSON), also a member of the committee, honors one of the earliest Korean American leaders of our Nation, Dosan Ahn Chang Ho. Each of the other 52 members of the California congressional delegation has also cosponsored the legislation, which I think in itself is worthy of mention.

Ahn Chang Ho emigrated to San Francisco from Korea in 1902. After Japan colonized Korea in 1910, Ahn Chang Ho traveled around the world to pull together financial and political opposition to Japan's imperial rule in Korea, and that lasted until the end of World War II. In addition to fighting for Korean freedom, Ahn Chang Ho worked hard here in the United States to establish schools, social organizations, and job-training programs for Korean Americans in California.

In 1932, the Japanese arrested Ahn Chang Ho in Shanghai, China, and accused him of a bombing incident in which he was not involved. He was taken to prison and ultimately died at a Korean hospital in 1938.

Mr. Speaker, Dosan Ahn Chang Ho was an extremely important political leader and educator and a humanitarian for people in the United States and Korea at the beginning of the 20th century. Therefore, I am pleased that the House is considering H.R. 1822. I commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) for her work.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in the consideration of H.R. 1822, legislation naming the postal facility in Los Angeles, California, after the honorable Dosan Ahn Chang Ho. This measure, which was introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) on April 11, 2003, was unanimously reported by our committee on April 1, 2004. It enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire California delegation.

Mr. Ahn was emigrated from Korea in 1902. He moved to San Francisco with his new wife. While en route to America, Mr. Ahn resolved to stand tall above the sea of turmoil existing at that time in Korea and to call himself Dosan, which means Island Mountain.

While living in San Francisco, Dosan organized and guided the Koreans living in the area to form the first Korean American community. Two years later, he moved with his family to Riverside, California, and again worked tirelessly to unite and organize Korean Americans. He established the first English school for Koreans and formed a cooperative association which later became the basis for the Korean National Association. Years later, Mr. Ahn served as president of that association.

Nine years later in 1913, Dosan Ahn Chang Ho moved to Los Angeles and

again played a significant role in the growth of the Korean American community in that city. In Los Angeles, he founded the Hung Sa Dahn, the Young Korean Academy. Mr. Ahn is credited with helping to relieve the blighted living conditions of his fellow Korean Americans and became the spiritual leader of the Korean Independence Movement.

Except for a brief 2-year return to the United States, Mr. Ahn then went to Shanghai to establish the Korean provisional government. He was a devoted independence fighter in China until his death in 1938.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), for seeking to honor the spiritual and humanitarian legacy of Dosan. His efforts to assist, organize, and lift up the Korean community in California were noble indeed. Naming a postal facility in Los Angeles after this great man is recognition of all his work on behalf of Korean Americans, and all Koreans.

I urge the swift adoption of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 1822, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1822.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING THE 91ST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE GARDEN CLUB OF AMERICA

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 97) recognizing the 91st annual meeting of the Garden Club of America.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 97

Whereas The Garden Club of America is holding its 91st annual meeting in Washington, DC April 24 through 27, 2004;

Whereas The Garden Club of America has 195 member clubs in 40 States and the District of Columbia, representing more than 17,000 members;

Whereas since its founding in 1913, The Garden Club of America has become a recognized leader in the fields of horticulture, conservation, historic preservation, and civic improvement, and an influential organization in the protection of America's environment; and

Whereas in our Nation's Capital, The Garden Club of America was instrumental in the founding of the National Arboretum, the development of the Archives of American Gardens at the Smithsonian Institution, and the creation and installation of the Butterfly Habitat Garden which now graces The National Mall at the National Museum of Natural History: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress commends The Garden Club of America for the many contributions it has made in our Nation's Capital and in communities across the United States, and sends its best wishes on the occasion of its 91st annual meeting in Washington, DC, April 24 through 27, 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

□ 1445

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. Con. Res. 97.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 recognizes the 91st annual meeting of the Garden Club of America. The resolution is timely because the Garden Club's annual meeting is here in Washington, D.C., this weekend from April 24 to 27.

So what is the Garden Club of America? The club is a national nonprofit organization that promotes gardening activities and restores, improves, and protects the quality of numerous aspects of the environment. The club has more than 17,000 members in 195 local chapters across the Nation.

We acknowledge the contributions of the Garden Club today because of their work to beautify so many of our Nation's communities.

Twelve local clubs here in the District of Columbia and nearby Maryland will host the annual national meeting this weekend. This year's meeting theme is "Capital Landscapes," and the distinguished honorary chair for the weekend is the First Lady of the United States, Laura Bush. It has been 20 years since Washington has hosted a national meeting, and so it is appropriate that we celebrate the Garden Club's return to our Nation's Capital.

I encourage all Members of the House to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 97.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the cold of winter warms to spring, and as trees bud and

flowers bloom, we pause to appreciate the beauty of nature. And so it is appropriate on this perfect spring day in our Nation's Capital that we recognize the Garden Club of America for its outstanding work throughout the United States.

Founded in 1913, the Garden Club of America has worked to share with others a respect for nature and an appreciation for its beauty. Today there are 195 member clubs in 40 States that work towards this collective goal for the benefit of us all.

By spreading its message of conservation and civic improvement, the Garden Club of America has helped to develop our scenic landscape and thereby had a profound impact on our country. We need to look no further than our Nation's Capital to understand that positive impact. While Washington, D.C., is known for its political debate, it is cherished by residents and visitors alike for the lush gardens and parks that provide us with a respite from brick and concrete of the city. The Garden Club of America has been instrumental in the beautification of our Nation's Capital by helping to create the National Arboretum, the Archives of American Gardens at the Smithsonian, as well as the annual cherry blossom display which brings joy to the many people it draws from around the world.

When George Washington chose this land to be our Nation's Capital, it was little more than swampland. It is now a beautiful city in which all Americans can take pride.

I know that there are those who will probably even admonish the Congress for taking time out to acknowledge the work done by those who have actually worked to help make and keep America beautiful. And I guess the realization has to be that America would not be as beautiful as it is unless there were some helping to make it so.

For this and for all the hard work the Garden Club of America does, we say thank you to the Garden Club. I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), a very good friend of the Garden Club, who also sponsored an identical piece of legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 368, here in the House.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 recognizing the Garden Club of America's 91st annual meeting this week here in Washington, D.C.

The Garden Club of America, founded in 1913, is a recognized national leader in the fields of horticulture, conservation, education, and civic improvement with 195 member clubs in 40 States and the District of Columbia.

Each year the Club holds its annual meeting in a different host city. This year 12 Garden Clubs in the District of

Columbia and the State of Maryland are hosting the meeting, which occurs in Washington, D.C., only once every 20 years.

In our Nation's Capital, the Garden Club of America was instrumental in the founding of the National Arboretum, the development of the Archives of American Gardens at the Smithsonian Institution, and the creation and installation of the Butterfly Habitat Garden which now graces the Mall at the National Museum of Natural History.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 to recognize the many contributions this organization has made in communities across our country and to send our best wishes on the occasion of the Garden Club of America's 91st annual meeting in Washington, D.C., April 24 through the 27.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I commend both the Senator from Maryland as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) for their work to recognize the Garden Club of America prior to their annual meeting this weekend. I urge the House to adopt Senate Concurrent Resolution 97.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. Con. Res. 97 and in recognition of the Garden Club of America and its members in central New Jersey.

Since its inception in 1913, the Garden Club of America has evolved from simply focusing on good gardening practices to becoming a leading advocacy group for environmental protection and community involvement. The men and women of the Garden Club work intimately with the soil and plants and know the value of clear air, clean water, and uncontaminated earth.

I work with Garden Club members in New Jersey and here in Washington, DC. They come to Capitol Hill to inform members of Congress about necessary protections for our air and water and necessary funding for preserving open space. Their hands-on work, literally, plays an equally important role in preserving the land and water around us. Garden Club members disseminate information on good gardening practices and maintenance of healthy lawns or golf courses with a minimum of chemicals. They also organize community events around gardening and provide scholarships and fellowships for young people interested in studying related fields.

The Garden Club of America has gone to great lengths to demonstrate the joys of horticulture to all Americans. They were instrumental in the founding of the National Arboretum and the Archives of American Gardens at the Smithsonian Institution and have played a significant role in the founding and upkeep of numerous other major gardens around the country.

Now, more than ever, these activists are turning their energies on the major environmental issues of the day. They are together a force to be reckoned with.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution and continuing to encourage the work of Garden Club of America members in their districts.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 97.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4037, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3855, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1822, by the yeas and nays.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second vote in this series will be a 5-minute vote.

RICHARD G. WILSON PROCESSING AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4037.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4037, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 0, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie	Bachus	Bartlett (MD)
Ackerman	Baird	Barton (TX)
Aderholt	Baker	Bass
Akin	Baldwin	Beauprez
Alexander	Ballance	Becerra
Allen	Ballenger	Bell
Baca	Barrett (SC)	Bereuter

Berkley	Frank (MA)	Markey
Berman	Franks (AZ)	Marshall
Berry	Galleghy	Matheson
Biggert	Garrett (NJ)	Matsui
Bilirakis	Gerlach	McCarthy (MO)
Bishop (GA)	Gibbons	McCarthy (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Gilchrest	McCollum
Blackburn	Gillmor	McCotter
Blumenauer	Gingrey	McDermott
Boehrlert	Graves	McGovern
Boehner	Goode	McHugh
Bonilla	Goodlatte	McInnis
Bonner	Gordon	McIntyre
Bono	Goss	McKeon
Boozman	Granger	McNulty
Boswell	Green (TX)	Meehan
Boucher	Green (WI)	Menendez
Boyd	Greenwood	Mica
Bradley (NH)	Grijalva	Michaud
Brady (PA)	Gutknecht	Millender-
Brady (TX)	Hall	McDonald
Brown (OH)	Harman	Miller (FL)
Brown (SC)	Harris	Miller (MI)
Brown, Corrine	Hart	Miller (NC)
Brown-Waite,	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Ginny	Hayes	Miller, George
Burgess	Hayworth	Mollohan
Burns	Hefley	Moore
Burr	Hensarling	Moran (KS)
Burton (IN)	Herger	Moran (VA)
Calvert	Hill	Murphy
Camp	Hinchey	Murtha
Cannon	Hinojosa	Musgrave
Capito	Hobson	Myrick
Capps	Hoekstra	Nadler
Capuano	Holden	Napolitano
Cardin	Holt	Neal (MA)
Cardoza	Honda	Nethercutt
Carson (IN)	Hooley (OR)	Neugebauer
Carson (OK)	Hostettler	Ney
Carter	Houghton	Northup
Case	Hoyer	Norwood
Castle	Hulshof	Nunes
Chabot	Hunter	Nussle
Chandler	Hyde	Oberstar
Chocola	Israel	Obey
Clay	Issa	Olver
Clyburn	Istook	Ortiz
Coble	Jackson (IL)	Osborne
Cole	Jackson-Lee	Ose
Collins	(TX)	Otter
Conyers	Jenkins	Owens
Cooper	John	Oxley
Costello	Johnson (CT)	Pallone
Cramer	Johnson (IL)	Pascarella
Crane	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Paul
Crowley	Jones (NC)	Payne
Cubin	Jones (OH)	Pearce
Culberson	Kanjorski	Pelosi
Cummings	Kaptur	Pence
Cunningham	Keller	Peterson (MN)
Davis (CA)	Kelly	Peterson (PA)
Davis (IL)	Kennedy (MN)	Petri
Davis (TN)	Kennedy (RI)	Pickering
Davis, Jo Ann	Kildee	Pitts
Davis, Tom	Kilpatrick	Platts
Deal (GA)	Kind	Pombo
DeFazio	King (IA)	Pomeroy
DeGette	King (NY)	Porter
Delahunt	Kirk	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Kline	Putnam
DeMint	Knollenberg	Quinn
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kolbe	Rahall
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaHood	Ramstad
Dicks	Lampson	Rangel
Dingell	Langevin	Regula
Doggett	Lantos	Rehberg
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Renzi
Duncan	Larson (CT)	Reyes
Edwards	Latham	Rodriguez
Ehlers	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)
Emanuel	Leach	Rogers (KY)
Emerson	Lee	Rogers (MI)
Engel	Levin	Rohrabacher
English	Lewis (CA)	Ross
Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Rothman
Etheridge	Lewis (KY)	Roybal-Allard
Evans	Linder	Royce
Everett	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Farr	LoBiondo	Rush
Fattah	Lofgren	Ryan (OH)
Feeney	Lowe	Ryan (WI)
Ferguson	Lucas (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Filner	Lucas (OK)	Sabo
Flake	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda
Foley	Majette	T.
Forbes	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta
Fossella	Manzullo	Sanders

Sandlin	Solis	Udall (NM)
Saxton	Souder	Upton
Schakowsky	Spratt	Van Hollen
Schiff	Stark	Velázquez
Schrock	Stearns	Visclosky
Scott (GA)	Stenholm	Vitter
Scott (VA)	Strickland	Walden (OR)
Sensenbrenner	Stupak	Walsh
Serrano	Sullivan	Wamp
Sessions	Tancred	Waters
Shadegg	Tanner	Watson
Shaw	Tauscher	Watt
Shays	Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Sherman	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Sherwood	Terry	Weldon (PA)
Shimkus	Thomas	Weller
Shuster	Thompson (CA)	Wexler
Simmons	Thompson (MS)	Whitfield
Simpson	Thornberry	Wicker
Skelton	Tiahrt	Wilson (NM)
Slaughter	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Smith (MI)	Tierney	Woolsey
Smith (NJ)	Towns	Wu
Smith (TX)	Turner (OH)	Wynn
Smith (WA)	Turner (TX)	Young (AK)
Snyder	Udall (CO)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—41

Andrews	Ford	McCrery
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Meek (FL)
Blunt	Frost	Meeks (NY)
Buyer	Gephardt	Portman
Cantor	Gonzalez	Pryce (OH)
Cox	Gutierrez	Radanovich
Davis (AL)	Hastings (FL)	Reynolds
Davis (FL)	Hoeffel	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLay	Inslee	Sweeney
Deutsch	Isakson	Tauzin
Dooley (CA)	Jefferson	Toomey
Doolittle	Kingston	Weiner
Dreier	Klecza	Wolf
Dunn	Kucinich	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1855

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL JOHN J. PERSHING POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3855.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3855, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—389

Abercrombie	Ballenger	Bilirakis
Ackerman	Barrett (SC)	Bishop (GA)
Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (NY)
Akin	Barton (TX)	Blackburn
Alexander	Bass	Blumenauer
Allen	Becerra	Boehrlert
Baca	Bell	Boehner
Bachus	Bereuter	Bonilla
Baird	Berkley	Bonner
Baker	Berman	Bono
Baldwin	Berry	Boozman
Ballance	Biggert	Boswell

Boucher Greenwood
 Boyd Grijalva
 Bradley (NH) Gutknecht
 Brady (PA) Hall
 Brady (TX) Harman
 Brown (OH) Harris
 Brown (SC) Hart
 Brown, Corrine Hastings (WA)
 Brown-Waite, Hayes
 Ginny Hayworth
 Burgess Hefley
 Burns Hensarling
 Burr Herger
 Burton (IN) Hill
 Calvert Hinchey
 Camp Hinojosa
 Cannon Hobson
 Capito Hoekstra
 Capps Holden
 Capuano Holt
 Cardin Honda
 Cardoza Hooley (OR)
 Carson (IN) Hostettler
 Carson (OK) Houghton
 Carter Hoyer
 Case Hulshof
 Castle Hunter
 Chabot Hyde
 Chandler Israel
 Chocola Issa
 Clay Istook
 Clyburn Jackson (IL)
 Coble Jackson-Lee
 Collins (TX)
 Conyers Jenkins
 Cooper John
 Costello Johnson (CT)
 Cramer Johnson (IL)
 Crane Johnson, E. B.
 Crenshaw Johnson, Sam
 Crowley Jones (NC)
 Cubin Jones (OH)
 Culberson Kanjorski
 Cummings Kaptur
 Cunningham Keller
 Davis (CA) Kelly
 Davis (IL) Kennedy (MN)
 Davis (TN) Kennedy (RI)
 Davis, Jo Ann Kildee
 Davis, Tom Kilpatrick
 Deal (GA) Kind
 DeFazio King (IA)
 DeGette King (NY)
 Delahunt Kirk
 DeLauro Kline
 DeMint Knollenberg
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kolbe
 Diaz-Balart, M. LaHood
 Dicks Lampson
 Dingell Langevin
 Doggett Lantos
 Doyle Larsen (WA)
 Duncan Larson (CT)
 Edwards Latham
 Ehlers LaTourette
 Emanuel Leach
 Emerson Lee
 Engel Levin
 English Lewis (CA)
 Eshoo Lewis (GA)
 Etheridge Lewis (KY)
 Evans Linder
 Everett Lipinski
 Farr LoBiondo
 Fattah Lofgren
 Feeney Lowey
 Ferguson Lucas (KY)
 Filner Lucas (OK)
 Flake Lynch
 Foley Majette
 Forbes Maloney
 Fossella Manzullo
 Frank (MA) Markey
 Franks (AZ) Marshall
 Gallegly Matheson
 Garrett (NJ) Matsui
 Gerlach McCarthy (MO)
 Gibbons McCarthy (NY)
 Gilchrest McCollum
 Gillmor McCotter
 Gingrey McDermott
 Goode McGovern
 Goodlatte McHugh
 Gordon McInnis
 Goss McNulty
 Granger Meehan
 Graves Menendez
 Green (TX)
 Green (WI)

Mica Michaud
 Millender-McDonald
 Miller (FL) Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI) Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC) Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary Miller, George
 Miller, George Mollohan
 Moore Moore
 Moran (KS) Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA) Moran (VA)
 Murphy Murphy
 Murtha Murtha
 Musgrave Musgrave
 Myrick Myrick
 Nadler Nadler
 Napolitano Napolitano
 Neal (MA) Neal (MA)
 Nethercutt Nethercutt
 Neugebauer Neugebauer
 Ney Ney
 Northup Northup
 Norwood Norwood
 Nussle Nussle
 Oberstar Oberstar
 Obey Obey
 Oliver Oliver
 Ortiz Ortiz
 Osborne Osborne
 Ose Ose
 Otter Otter
 Owens Owens
 Oxley Oxley
 Pallone Pallone
 Pascrell Pascrell
 Pastor Pastor
 Paul Paul
 Payne Payne
 Pearce Pearce
 Pelosi Pelosi
 Pence Pence
 Peterson (MN) Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA) Peterson (PA)
 Petri Petri
 Pickering Pickering
 Pitts Pitts
 Platts Platts
 Pombo Pombo
 Pomeroy Pomeroy
 Porter Porter
 Price (NC) Price (NC)
 Putnam Putnam
 Quinn Quinn
 Rahall Rahall
 Ramstad Ramstad
 Rangel Rangel
 Regula Regula
 Rehberg Rehberg
 Renzi Renzi
 Reyes Reyes
 Rodriguez Rodriguez
 Rogers (AL) Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY) Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI) Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher Rohrabacher
 Ross Ross
 Rothman Rothman
 Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard
 Royce Royce
 Ruppersberger Ruppersberger
 Rush Rush
 Ryan (OH) Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI) Ryan (WI)
 Ryan (KS) Ryan (KS)
 Sabo Sabo
 Sanchez, Linda Sanchez, Linda
 T. T.
 Sanchez, Loretta Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanders Sanders
 Sandlin Sandlin
 Saxton Saxton
 Schakowsky Schakowsky
 Schiff Schiff
 Schrock Schrock
 Scott (GA) Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA) Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner
 Serrano Serrano
 Sessions Sessions
 Shadegg Shadegg
 Shaw Shaw
 Shays Shays
 Sherman Sherman
 Sherwood Sherwood
 Shimkus Shimkus
 Shuster Shuster
 Simmons Simmons

Simpson
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Souder
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher

Andrews
 Beauprez
 Bishop (UT)
 Blunt
 Buyer
 Cantor
 Cole
 Cox
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (FL)
 DeLay
 Deutsch
 Dooley (CA)
 Doolittle
 Dreier

Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Towns
 Turner (OH)
 Turner (TX)
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Vitter

NOT VOTING—44

Dunn
 Ford
 Frelinghuysen
 Frost
 Gephardt
 Gonzalez
 Gutierrez
 Hastings (FL)
 Hoeftel
 Inslee
 Isakson
 Jefferson
 Kingston
 Kleczka
 Kucinich

Walden (OR)
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

McCrery
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Nunes
 Portman
 Pryce (OH)
 Radanovich
 Reynolds
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Sweeney
 Tauzin
 Toomey
 Weiner
 Wolf

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1904

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HON. BILLY TAUZIN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, THANKS MEMBERS FOR THEIR SUPPORT

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was with the Governor of Texas yesterday, and we called the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) at M.D. Anderson, and he asked that I rise tonight and thank Members on both sides of the aisle for your letters and prayers. He specifically asked me to thank all Members for the support that you have been providing him. He is doing well. He made a good recovery from his surgery. He is beginning his chemotherapy and radiation, and he asked that I extend his thanks to each and every Member.

DOSAN AHN CHANG HO POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1822.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1822, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Allen
 Baca
 Bachus
 Baird
 Baker
 Ballance
 Ballenger
 Barrett (SC)
 Bartlett (MD)
 Barton (TX)
 Bass
 Beauprez
 Becerra
 Bell
 Bereuter
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggart
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonner
 Bono
 Boozman
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Bradley (NH)
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (OH)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite, Ginny
 Burgess
 Burns
 Burr
 Burton (IN)
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Cardoza
 Carter
 Case
 Castle
 Chabot
 Chandler
 Chocola
 Clay
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cole
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costello
 Cramer
 Crane
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cubin
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (TN)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 DeMint
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duncan
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Emanuel
 Emerson
 Engel
 English
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Evans
 Everett
 Farr
 Fattah
 Feeney
 Ferguson
 Filner
 Flake
 Foley
 Forbes
 Fossella
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Gordon
 Goss
 Graves
 Green (TX)
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Grijalva
 Gutknecht
 Hall
 Harman
 Harris
 Hart
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Holt
 Honda
 Hooley (OR)
 Hostettler
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Israel
 Issa
 Istook
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 Davis (TN)

Jenkins
 John
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kline
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Lucas (OK)
 Lynch
 Majette
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Markey
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Menendez
 Mica
 Michaud
 Millender-McDonald
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy
 Murtha
 Musgrave
 Myrick
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Nethercutt

Neugebauer	Rogers (MI)	Strickland
Ney	Rohrabacher	Stupak
Northup	Ross	Sullivan
Norwood	Rothman	Tancredo
Nunes	Roybal-Allard	Tanner
Nussle	Royce	Tauscher
Oberstar	Ruppersberger	Taylor (MS)
Obey	Rush	Taylor (NC)
Olver	Ryan (OH)	Terry
Ortiz	Ryan (WI)	Thomas
Osborne	Ryun (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Ose	Sabo	Thompson (MS)
Otter	Sánchez, Linda	Thornberry
Owens	T.	Tiahrt
Oxley	Sanchez, Loretta	Tiberi
Pallone	Sanders	Tierney
Pascarella	Sandlin	Towns
Pastor	Saxton	Turner (OH)
Paul	Schakowsky	Turner (TX)
Payne	Schiff	Udall (CO)
Pearce	Schrock	Udall (NM)
Pelosi	Scott (GA)	Upton
Pence	Scott (VA)	Van Hollen
Peterson (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Velázquez
Peterson (PA)	Serrano	Visclosky
Petri	Sessions	Vitter
Pickering	Shadegg	Walden (OR)
Pitts	Shaw	Walsh
Platts	Shays	Wamp
Pombo	Sherman	Waters
Pomeroy	Sherwood	Watson
Porter	Shimkus	Watt
Portman	Shuster	Waxman
Price (NC)	Simmons	Weldon (FL)
Pryce (OH)	Simpson	Weldon (PA)
Putnam	Skelton	Weller
Quinn	Slaughter	Wexler
Rahall	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Ramstad	Smith (NJ)	Wicker
Rangel	Smith (TX)	Wilson (NM)
Regula	Smith (WA)	Wilson (SC)
Rehberg	Snyder	Woolsey
Renzi	Solis	Wu
Reyes	Souder	Wynn
Reynolds	Spratt	Young (AK)
Rodriguez	Stark	Young (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Stearns	
Rogers (KY)	Stenholm	

NOT VOTING—34

Andrews	Frost	McCrery
Baldwin	Gephardt	Meek (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)
Buyer	Granger	Radanovich
Collins	Gutierrez	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis (AL)	Hastings (FL)	Sweeney
Davis (FL)	Hoeffel	Tauzin
Deutsch	Inslee	Toomey
Dooley (CA)	Isakson	Weiner
Dunn	Jefferson	Wolfe
Ford	Klecza	
Frelinghuysen	Kucinich	

□ 1925

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the chamber today during rollcall votes No. 118, No. 119, and No. 120. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all of these votes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, April 21, 2004, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, April 22, 2004, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, April 22, 2004, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ASSAULT WEAPONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in 146 days assault weapons will be back on our streets. In 146 days drug lords, criminals, cop killers will be able to buy the gun of their choice. If this House is not allowed to bring up the renewal of assault weapons ban, in 146 days we will be going back 10 years in time.

We have proof that, since assault weapons have been off the streets, many lives have been saved.

Unfortunately, today is the fifth anniversary of the Columbine High School shooting. One of the weapons used in the shooting that day was the Tec-9. This weapon of war allowed two high school students to fire 55 rounds into students and teachers in a matter of minutes. Thirteen people were killed that day, 21 wounded.

The gun did what it was designed to do. It is an excellent product. It is a product that is out there to shoot rapidly, to kill as many people as possible in a short period of time. This gun did its job that day. In 146 days we are going to allow these guns back on the street.

These are the guns that we see being used over in Iraq, the same as an AK-47, the Uzis, the guns that were on our streets 10 years ago. And now we are going to go back and allow those guns back on the streets?

Where is the common sense? Gun owners across this country agree that these guns should not be allowed on the streets. Our police throughout this Nation have enough on their hands try-

ing to find the terrorists that are supposedly in this country; and yet this administration, this House, will do nothing.

President Bush in 2000 said that he would sign a bill to renew the assault weapons if it came onto his desk. The President has been extremely effective. Every bill that has come through this House has landed on his desk. But that is because he worked it.

It is going to be up to the American people to start e-mailing their Congressmen, their Senators, the Speaker of the House, everyone, to allow this bill to come back on the floor for a vote.

Mother's Day in 2000, we had over 750,000 moms, dads, uncles, victims gathered down here in Washington to try to do something about gun violence in this country.

□ 1930

This Mother's Day, again, the million moms are coming down here to have their voices heard. We are going to be doing this all over the Nation. Again, the American people have the opportunity to make a difference, but you cannot just talk about it. You have to really get out there and say, enough is enough.

We should be having an assault on the assault weapons. The millions of dollars that are spent every single year on gun violence in this country could be used towards our schools. The billions of dollars that it costs this country on health care because of gun violence could be used towards our health care system.

One person can make a difference, but it is a lot easier when that one becomes two and three and then thousands. We can do this. Many of us here on the House floor will fight for you, but we have to outnumber the NRA. Believe me, the numbers are small. They talk about 4 million NRA members. There are only actually 435,000 of them that have a grip on this House. Our nurses across the country, our doctors, if we only took the health care providers, we could make a difference.

I ask the American people for help. It is 146 days before the assault weapons go back on our streets. Is that what we want in our communities? Is that what we want for our children of this Nation? Is that the bloodshed we want to see in this country?

THE FREEDOM FLAT TAX ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, during these last 2 weeks back home in my district, I had a lot of discussion about income tax, because, of course, April 15 fell during our recess this year. A lot of people are asking me, what has ever happened to the concept of fundamental tax reform in the House of Representatives? Why can we not as the

American people create a system that promotes fairness and economic prosperity by treating everyone the same, regardless of income or occupation, and removing special preferences and disincentives for economic growth that characterize our current IRS Tax Code? They also ask, when will it be time to eliminate our current code's bias against savings and investment?

Currently interest rates are at historic lows. It is hard enough to convince people to put money in a savings account, because it doesn't pay very much, and, on top of that, you pay at the highest rate on the money you earn on that savings account, certainly a disincentive for savings. When savings are no longer taxed twice, I believe people will save and invest more, leading to higher productivity and greater take-home pay.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago, my third month in Congress, I introduced a bill, H.R. 1783, called The Freedom Flat Tax Act. The Freedom Flat Tax Act allows people to opt into a progrowth tax system that restores fairness, simplicity and efficiency to our current Tax Code. It replaces our current costly tax system with a single-rate system that, most importantly, only taxes income one time.

This flat tax could be phased in over a 3-year period, with a 19 percent rate for the first 2 years, with a 17 percent rate in subsequent years. There would be no deductions or loopholes. It will allow some personal exemptions, including \$5,500 for each dependent.

The key is this flat tax was a little different from other flat taxes that have been introduced in this Congress. The most important difference is that this fundamental change in tax structure is actually within our reach. It is within our reach this year, if we were to choose to do it.

It is optional. If a family has constructed their savings or their life so that they do well under the IRS code, they are welcome to stay in the IRS code. But if they find that they would like simplicity and efficiency in their life, they are allowed the option to elect into a simple, fairer system; a simple, fairer, single-rate system. There would be no ability to move in between the two systems once the election has been made. It would be permanent.

Mr. Speaker, back in my district in Dallas, there is a financial columnist who writes an article for the Dallas Morning News named Scott Burns. He is certainly no great friend of the Republican Party. He has been critical of us on several occasions. But he wrote an article that dealt with home ownership and the home mortgage deduction, and you do get a lot of concern from people who say, gosh, I get my home mortgage deduction now, and I would hate to give that up.

But Mr. BURNS' study showed across the country, the amount that you are able to save off your income taxes varies greatly depending upon where you

live. Around Dallas, Texas, the average homeowner's savings over 3 years' time is about \$1,000. Down in San Antonio, Texas, it is even less. It is about \$100. In Santa Barbara, California, it is \$42,000, so clearly a resident of Santa Barbara, California, would probably like to stay in the current IRS code, but my constituents around Dallas should be given the option of a code that makes more sense for them.

It would be enormously easier to figure current tax bill under a single-rate system. Simply subtract and pay 17 percent of your wages after the personal exemptions.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us in this body to take the concept of fundamental fairness in the Tax Code to the next level. I know there are others on my side of the aisle who argue for a Federal retail sales tax. I can tell you there are parts of that that seem agreeable to me as well, but the reality is the implementation of that type of tax would be costly, and it would be disruptive in the economy.

Our current situation, people who fill out the 1040-EZ form spend 3½ hours to do their taxes; The regular form, they will spend 13½ hours doing their taxes. Billions of hours are spent complying with Tax Code forms instead of being with your family.

The current Tax Code is expensive. The average household pays \$2,000 a year in compliance costs. For the year 2001 alone, Americans lost \$183 billion in opportunity costs instead of working on money-producing activity for themselves or their families.

As I stated before, the current Tax Code punishes hard work and doubly punishes savings. We pay the government to take our hard-earned money off our hands just so they can punish us for job-creating behavior.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now, the power is within our grasp. I urge my colleagues to take a look at H.R. 1783, and let us see if we cannot make that a reality for the American people next year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFazio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SAVE THE HUBBLE SPACE TELESCOPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to deliver the thoughtful opinions about the Hubble Space Telescope from the fifth grade math class at Island Park Elementary School. All 25 students unanimously believe that the Hubble Space Telescope should be saved.

I recently visited Thelma Ritchie's class as a part of Hubble Awareness Day. It is a program I started to listen directly to the American people about the future of the Hubble Space Telescope. According to the Administrator of NASA, the Hubble has no future. Mr. O'Keefe may be the only person in America who actually believes that, but he certainly is one person who can kill the Hubble if he wants to.

Students at Island Park Elementary believe Hubble should have a future. So do I. So do millions of other students and scientists and ordinary people across America.

Thelma Ritchie's students recently spent the entire week working on Hubble-related activities. The day I was there, students were using Hubble images and math to learn how to accurately estimate the billions of stars visible without counting all of them.

The classroom fueled inspiration amid the wonder of scientific discovery. Hubble pictures were everywhere. You could see the excitement and wonder in the eyes of very young students. Some had crafted Hubble models. Others had drawings. Many of them were totally engaged in the pursuit of scientific discovery inspired by the Hubble Telescope.

Thelma's classroom, like every math and science classroom in America, is an incubator for future scientists, astronauts and astronomers, and one tool at their disposal will be lost if we do not act and save the Hubble.

Before I arrived, Ms. Ritchie had given her young scientists an assignment: Read the House Resolution that 47 colleagues and I have sponsored to save the Hubble and tell us what to do. Here is what the students said.

From Claire and Juliana: "Without the Hubble, space would be a half-solved code for us to crack."

Byron said: "In my opinion, NASA should go and fix the Hubble, since it has been giving tons of information."

Matt said: "I think NASA should keep Hubble up there," and Charlotte added, "because then younger kids can get more interested in science."

Shoshana offered this: "Advice for NASA would be pretty much to listen to the public and scientists and do what is best for us all."

Sidney said: "Not only does it give scientists answers, but it teaches kids way more about space."

Alyssa was even more direct: "I disagree with NASA and I think they should keep the Hubble."

NASA's Administrator claimed that safety is the reason for letting the Hubble die, that it would be too risky to send the space shuttle to service the Hubble, as it has in the past.

Let us be clear: Space flight is risky, and safety must be paramount. But it is hard to follow the Administrator's logic on safety at the same time the administration wants to go to Mars. I think Mr. O'Keefe is seeing red, partly over the criticism of Hubble, but mostly because the President wants to go to

Mars. Personally, I wish he would, but that is a different discussion.

Hubble's mission is not over. Hundreds of millions of dollars in new Hubble equipment, some of it designed with the help of University of Washington astronomers, is built, paid for and ready for deployment. Tens of millions of dollars of equipment is already built.

Hubble's mission is not over. There are new worlds to discover, new images to take us even closer to the moment of creation and more children across America to inspire.

The Hubble Space Telescope has produced great advancements in science, yet Hubble's most important contribution may be its inspiration. It is the cheapest ad ever produced to encourage young children to become scientists. If anyone needs reassurance that America can compete globally in math and science, they should visit Thelma Ritchie's fifth grade class at the Island Park School. You know how to do math, and so do they. Here is their answer: Two plus two equals save the Hubble.

COMMISSIONER GORELICK MUST STEP DOWN FROM 9/11 COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today seeking answers to very tough questions. Like many Americans, I have been following the 9/11 Commission hearings with very keen interest. As an American, I want to know how the terrorists infiltrated our borders without detection, and, as a Congresswoman, I have a responsibility to implement policies that protect our country. I view this duty as one of my most urgent and most sacred obligations.

At the outset, let me be clear: I do not seek to blame anyone for 9/11, not anyone but the terrorists and their evil supporters. However, I do want to know what happened and what our government can do to make sure that attacks like those on 9/11 never happen again. Therefore, like millions of others, I am eagerly awaiting the report from the 9/11 Commission.

Unfortunately, and to my disappointment, during the hearings last week it became clear that Americans may not be able to get the complete and honest picture that we deserve. Let me explain what I mean.

Last week, under oath, Attorney General John Ashcroft introduced a recently declassified memo by Commissioner Jamie Gorelick regarding the now familiar wall separating the Federal agencies from intelligence agencies. For her part, Ms. Gorelick responded to these charges in an editorial in the Washington Post. However, many tough questions still re-

main. Ms. Gorelick highlighted why her testimony is so crucial, if not critical, to understanding why our government failed in detecting these attacks.

At the closing of her editorial, Ms. Gorelick says she made all relevant opinions and briefs available to the Commission. However, the Commission would not accept this reply from National Security Director Condoleezza Rice, and they most definitely should not accept this excuse from one of their own members.

Now, I am not in a position right now to judge the validity of these competing claims. Most of us are not in a position to say whether Attorney General Ashcroft is right or wrong. I do not know if, in fact, Ms. Gorelick's policies prevented us from catching the terrorists. I do not know if the current administration could have done more to tear down this wall. But I do know that we need to have, and Americans deserve, the full and complete answer to these questions.

Never mind that resolving the dispute between Attorney General Ashcroft and Commissioner Gorelick is the essence of this Commission's charge. Never mind that Condoleezza Rice was subject to intense criticism for refusing to testify under oath, which, by the way, she finally did. Never mind the fact that Dr. Kissinger was widely criticized and stepped down for far less of an appearance of conflict of interest than Ms. Gorelick has. Never mind that the Gorelick memo is the biggest news out of the hearings thus far. And, obviously, we must keep in mind the glaring self-interests of this Commissioner.

We believe that the Commission's charge is that all witnesses with essential information, particularly with the ability to clarify policies, must testify. Why is Ms. Gorelick above the standard? The American people, the victims' families and the Commission have a right to hear from Ms. Gorelick in public under oath.

□ 1945

Simple logic tells us that simply recusing herself from her activities will not suffice. Ms. Gorelick must step down.

She must submit her actions and the actions of her Justice Department to the same scrutiny that Dr. Rice and the current administration faces.

How can she claim impartial judgment on policies she so obviously disagrees with?

How can she comment on the failings of our intelligence and law enforcement communities if her policies actually influence those failings?

In short, how can she be on both sides of the witness table?

We created this commission to assess our weaknesses and to make recommendations. To that end, we need to continue the tough, honest questionings that have been the hallmark of these hearings. If Ms. Gorelick refuses to step aside and submit herself

under oath to questioning, then the outcome of this commission must be looked at in an entirely different and very tainted light.

We would have to ask ourselves what we do not know from what now seems to be destined to be an incomplete record. Knowing what we know about Ms. Gorelick's policies, we must demand she answer for them if only to clear up the charges brought by Attorney General Ashcroft that her policies were to blame.

There are many questions to be answered. And obviously Ms. Gorelick must step down and testify under oath.

THE FAILED ECONOMIC POLICIES OF THIS ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, prior to our recess, the House voted on a \$2.3 trillion budget with a \$521 billion deficit, showing that it is impossible to finance three wars with three tax cuts.

This budget, the budget by the President and Republican majority, repeats the same mistakes that have resulted in a jobless economy and a health care and wage recession with the lowest growth in wages in the period of economic growth in the last 30 years.

We have 2.5 million Americans that have lost their jobs in the last 3 years, 43 million Americans without health care, 2 million Americans who were once in the middle class and now in poverty, 1.6 percent job wage growth in the areas of salaries, and \$1 trillion in corporate and individual foreclosures and bankruptcies. That is the economic record of this administration as embodied by the budget the President submitted.

During the 2000 Presidential election, President Bush declared that he was opposed to nation-building. Who knew it was America he was talking about when he said he was opposed to nation-building. This budget and the President's economic vision is really a tale of two budgets. We look at his vision for the United States, and we look at his vision for Iraq. We spent more than \$100 billion in Iraq on the occupation, but without promising the same promise and same future here at home to the American people.

I am not opposed to rebuilding in Iraq, but I am opposed to making the investments at home while we are making the same investments in Iraq.

Let us take a look at it. Today we provide universal health care coverage in Iraq as one of our goals. 44 million Americans are without health insurance; 33 million Americans work full time with no health care.

There is universal job training in Iraq, and yet in the President's own budget we have cut back on the funds for job training. In health, 2,200 Iraqis health professionals and 8,000 volunteers are receiving free training. In

America, health training funds in the President's budget were cut by 64 percent. 150 clinics and hospitals have been rebuilt to serve 3 million Iraqis, and yet in America community health care clinics are cut by 91 percent in the President's budget.

Under veterans, \$60 million has been spent to train Iraqi veterans of past wars, but we are cutting veterans medical care here in the United States by \$257 million.

In the area of education, we have built or rebuilt 2,300 schools in Iraq, but Leave No Child Behind is underfunded by \$8 billion in the President's budget.

Iraqi universities are getting \$20 million for higher ed partnerships; but in America, the Pell grant has been frozen for 3 years while the cost for education has gone up 10 percent.

The area of law enforcement, \$500 million to train the Iraqi police, yet the COPS program in the United States under the President's budget was cut by \$659 million.

In the area of public housing, \$470 million is being spent for Iraqi public housing; yet here in the United States, \$791 million is cut from section 8 vouchers.

In the environment, we are paying \$3.6 billion for clean water and sewage systems in Iraq; and in America, under the President's budget, we cut \$500 million from the clean water for safe drinking water here in the United States.

In the area of infrastructure, the port of Umm Qasar was completely rebuilt in Iraq, yet the Corps of Engineers budget under the President's budget was cut by 10 percent.

Roads, we spent \$240 million on roads and bridges in Iraq. Here at home, the President has a veto threat on our highway and mass transit programs.

As President Bush seeks reelection, he can say he kept his commitment against nation-building. The problem is his opposition to nation-building is here at home. With this budget, the administration, the President is telling the American people that they have two priorities, two sets of values, two sets of books: one for the Iraqi people and one for the American people. And yet those are the wrong values.

The American people are the most generous people in the world. They are willing to commit to Iraq's future, one of a better tomorrow, but not at the expense that comes at the expense of America's tomorrow; not that comes at the expense of America's children.

America can no longer be so generous around the world if the future that we hold for the American people is less than the one we are promising in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the same values that we hold for Iraq we must pledge for all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PRESIDENT'S INATTENTION TO MANUFACTURING AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a week ago this evening right around this time, President Bush held his third news conference in 3 years during prime time for the American people to examine his record and for them to watch the President answer for some of his policies, good and bad.

The President, if you recall watching that news conference, was asked by a reporter if he would outline what his largest mistake or one of his biggest mistakes was as President. And the President literally could not think of a mistake that he had made.

Well, tonight the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), and I are going to help the President a little bit, not to make the President look bad, that is not really our mission, but to help the President help the Nation understand what some of those mistakes are by pointing them out, perhaps forcing the President to think a little more about them, because I do not think he has given a lot of thought to his mistakes and some of the wrong directions and wrong courses that he has taken the country and ultimately to learn from those mistakes and then to correct those mistakes.

I was speaking with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) a moment ago. He said when he was a child he was taught over and over, and probably everybody in this Chamber has been taught, that one of the first things you do is you learn from your mistakes. But obviously you need to recognize those mistakes.

This chart here tonight just gives an idea of some of the issues that the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) and I and others this week will discuss about some of the President's mistakes with weapons of mass destruction, with Medicare, and veterans, tax cuts with small business, with manufacturing, with Head Start, the energy bill, flip-flopping on a whole host of issues, the environment, and many others that we will get to later.

But I want to talk tonight about the President's inattention to manufacturing and to the economy. And to me, I do not think there is a person watching when the President kind of stood back almost in shock and said I just cannot think of any mistakes. I just cannot think of any mistakes.

I think almost every American thought about our economy, how there are schools in decline, in part because

of Federal inaction and Federal wrong action, about the environment, about the job situation, about their communities. And tonight I want to point out that the President's largest mistake on the economy may have been embodied in this economic report of the President, something that the President's chief economic advisor put out not too long ago signed by the President on page 4.

In this economic report, the President and his chief economic adviser kind of trumpet their success in the economy. They say we predicted 2.6 million jobs would be created this year, even though they have already lost 3 million jobs.

Then the President's chief economic adviser, and probably his largest mistake in showing how he really has not thought about this, the President's economic adviser trumpeted outsourcing, saying that outsourcing, our losing jobs to other countries, whether they are blue collar manufacturing jobs, they are steel and auto machine tools, chemicals, whatever, or whether they are white collar jobs, maybe phone operators, maybe computer programmers, maybe even radiologists as we have outsourced those jobs, the President's chief economic adviser said outsourcing is just a new way of doing international trade. More things are tradeable than were in the past, and that is a good thing.

Secretary Snow, the President's appointee as the Secretary of the Treasury, said outsourcing is part of trade. It is one aspect of trade, and there cannot be any doubt about the fact that trade makes the economy stronger.

It is hard for me to think that the American people when they hear George Bush say I cannot think of a mistake I made, that they do not think about the lost manufacturing jobs in this country.

My State of Ohio, we have lost 2,000 manufacturing jobs in my State every week. We have lost more than 200 jobs every single day in manufacturing in the Bush administration. One out of six manufacturing jobs in Ohio, not temporary layoffs, those jobs have gone to China, those jobs have gone to Mexico, those jobs have disappeared.

The President's answer, when he does reflect on his mistakes, when he does reflect on the economy, he has had two answers. He said we need to do more tax cuts for the most privileged, trickle down economics, hoping that will perhaps create some jobs in the country. It clearly has not. We have lost 3 million jobs in the United States. His other answer is outsourcing. His other answer is more trade agreements, more NAFTA-like trade agreements that ship jobs overseas, that hemorrhage jobs to China, that hemorrhage jobs to Mexico, that send our good-paying industrial jobs abroad.

And as we tonight, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentlewoman

from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) tomorrow night and many of us try to help the President through this, remind him of the mistakes that he has made, we also have an obligation to talk about what we should do. And what we should do with this economy, we can talk about these mistakes, but what we should do is we should first of all extend unemployment compensation, second we should pass the Crane-Rangel bill, which gives incentives for those corporations that actually produce manufacturing jobs in the United States instead of rewarding those companies that ship jobs overseas.

The President's mistakes can be fixed. We need to fix them by doing some of the things I just talked about.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S MISTAKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, if and when the President has another prime time press conference, and if the President is asked again to consider the mistakes that he has made, I have a suggestion: he might mention the thousands of soldiers in Iraq who have and are now risking their lives without appropriate body armor and other life-saving equipment.

We are finding out now that the President and his advisers and Cabinet were thinking about this war in Iraq for a very long time. And yet here is an AP story from March 26 of this year. It says soldiers headed for Iraq are still buying their own body armor. In many cases their families are buying it for them despite assurances from the military that the gear will be in hand before they are in harm's way.

Last October, last October, that is 8 months after the war started, it was reported that nearly one quarter of American troops serving in Iraq did not have ceramic-plated body armor which can stop bullets fired from assault rifles and shrapnel.

□ 2000

The military says the shortfall is over and soldiers who do not yet have the armor soon will.

"Nancy Durst," I am still quoting from the AP story, "recently learned that her husband, a soldier with an Army Reserve unit from Maine serving in Iraq, spent 4 months without body armor. She said she would have bought armor for her husband had vests not been cycled into his unit. Even if her husband now has body armor, Durst says she is angry he was without it at any time." Her husband also told her that reservists have not been given the same equipment as Active Duty soldiers. "They are so sick and tired of being treated as second-class soldiers," she said.

That is from the AP story. No wonder she is mad about it. This armor costs about \$1,500. And I hope the President

will support legislation that will reimburse the soldiers and families for this expense. Clearly this was a mistake. And so if asked about a mistake, the President could not only say that it was a mistake, but maybe he would like to support H.R. 3615. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) has a bill that would reimburse the families for the expense of buying their own body armor.

According to the Enlisted Association of the National Guard, as of November 30, 2003, the Army National Guard lacked \$11 billion of the \$40 billion in military equipment and training it needed to go to war. Among the missing crucial equipment components were nearly 11,000 Humvees, 20,000 radios, 156,000 night vision goggles and 148 Black Hawk helicopters that are required to meet modernization requirements.

That seems to me to be a mistake. Our troops were not properly equipped. Currently we are told that every member of the National Guard is being provided with body armor once they are in Iraq, but many of the soldiers are not even given an opportunity to train with the modern equipment before deployment.

On November 2, 2003, an Illinois National Guard Chinook helicopter was downed. This helicopter was not equipped with the latest automatic antimissile blocking system. I met the aunt of one of the soldiers who went down in that Chinook, who died because of that accident. I think she would like to tell the President that was a mistake, the cost of life of her nephew.

We know that soldiers coming home on R and R were being asked to pay to get to their homes once they came to the United States. Now, that was a mistake. The President could say that that was fixed, but is he going to support legislation introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) to reimburse the families for their travel?

How about the fact that soldiers, wounded soldiers in the hospital, were being charged every day for their food? Well, we have corrected that, thank goodness, but that is something that the President might think about as a mistake that was clearly made and affected our troops.

Now for the latest report that I heard of from my State of Illinois. This was on CBS local news today, I believe. The 333rd Military Police Unit in Freeport, which just had their tour in Iraq extended, may not be adequately supplied for battle. That is because everything they owned was shipped back home. The 333rd is presently sitting on the Kuwaiti border awaiting orders, but they have since surrendered their equipment such as radios and armored vehicles to the troops who replaced them. But now since the 333rd is going to remain in Iraq, they are without any supplies. Even their personal belongings were sent home, including spare

uniforms, boots and toiletries. The soldiers only have what they are wearing and are being forced to purchase new uniforms and some equipment out of their own pockets. Military families have been receiving their soldiers' footlockers the past few days and are now frantically repacking boxes and sending all of this gear back at their own expense. This has angered families who did not believe the military thought this redeployment through.

Let me just say that the DOD has responded to these families, saying that they are looking into whether they will be reimbursed for sending equipment back.

A few mistakes. I will forward this to the President. Maybe he would like to use it at his next press conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNHAPPY EARTH DAY FOR EPA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mention another mistake that President Bush has made: His mistake in forgetting that protecting our environment is a bipartisan effort that for 30 years has put people over polluters and public health over profits.

President Bush forgot that both Earth Day and the Environmental Protection Agency were born in 1970, created from the bipartisan resolve to clean up and protect our environment. As we prepare to mark Earth Day on April 22, the unhappy consequences of the President's mistakes are clear. The Bush administration is undermining EPA's years of hard-won achievements in carrying out and enforcing our Nation's bipartisan environmental laws.

EPA's mission is to protect human health and safeguard the natural environment, air, water and land. The Bush administration is retreating from EPA's mission and instead making politically driven decisions that benefit polluters at the expense of the American public. At a time when we should be strengthening our environmental protections, the Bush administration has taken steps to weaken our environmental protections and the enforcement of our existing environmental laws.

Rolling back bipartisan environmental protection is President Bush's mistake, but it is not an accident. There is a deliberate, systematic three-step plan from this administration.

Step one is to try to pass weak environmental legislation. Step two is to seek to weaken Agency regulations. And if all else fails, step three is to cut the enforcement budget to disable Agency compliance efforts.

A quick review of the administration's failures to clean up air pollution highlight the trends. EPA should be taking action to clean up mercury pollution from power plants, but the Bush administration has failed to take that action. Mercury pollution has poisoned the fish in millions of acres of our lakes and thousands of miles of our streams. And according to EPA scientists, approximately 630,000 infants are born in the United States each year with blood mercury levels at an unsafe level.

As required by the Clean Air Act in December of 2000, EPA determined that it was appropriate and necessary to regulate mercury emissions from power plants, the single largest source of mercury in the United States. But in December of 2003, when the Bush administration's EPA released its proposal for controlling mercury, it was shockingly inadequate. The Clean Air Act requires a much larger reduction in mercury pollution in much less time than the Bush EPA proposal.

Tellingly the Bush proposal is exactly what the power industry wanted. In fact, parts of the administration's mercury proposal were literally copied from memos prepared by industry lobbyists. Last month's Los Angeles Times article revealed that EPA staff were not told to perform studies on the costs and public health benefits of more stringent mercury reduction proposals, even though such studies were requested by the expert panel tasked with recommending an appropriate regulation. Also shocking is that the White House apparently made considerable changes to the EPA's mercury proposal before its release, minimizing the health risk of mercury exposure.

In addition, the Bush administration has failed to require power plants to install modern pollution controls. In August 2003, the Bush EPA finalized a rule that significantly weakens the Clean Air Act by allowing thousands of old power plants to make upgrades to their plants without installing pollution controls. If EPA's rule stands up to current legal challenges, these power plants and factories will be allowed to continue to pollute the air with no responsibility for the resulting damage to the American people. According to technical studies using EPA models, the result will be at least 4,300 premature deaths and at least 80,000 asthma attacks each year that could otherwise be prevented by simply requiring modern pollution controls.

EPA should be taking action to address global warming, but the Bush ad-

ministration has refused to address this important issue. A report by the U.S. National Research Council commissioned by the Bush administration confirmed that greenhouse gases are increasing the temperatures of the Earth's air and oceans primarily caused by human activity. There is overwhelming evidence that greenhouse gases must be reduced in order to slow global warming, yet in March 2001, the Bush administration refused to take any responsibility for reducing global warming when it rejected the Kyoto Protocol.

The administration then announced last summer that EPA does not have the authority to regulate carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, reversing a Bush campaign promise and a legal opinion issued by the EPA general counsel under the Clinton administration. Rather than taking real action, the Bush administration's answer to air pollution has been to introduce the so-called Clear Skies Initiative, which environmental experts say would actually result in weaker standards for controlling pollution from power plants than existing laws being enforced.

The administration's failure to enforce environmental law extends beyond the Clean Air Act. The EPA's own research shows that polluters are egregiously violating the Clean Water Act. According to EPA data, 60 percent of large facilities across the country exceeded their Clean Water Act permit at least once between January of 2002 and June of 2003. Large facilities that exceed their permits are dumping on average six times more pollution into our waterways than they are allowed. In spite of these facts, EPA's enforcement of the Clean Water Act are declining.

Mr. Speaker, we must take action to clean up our air and water pollution and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The EPA must be empowered and provided the resources to carry out its mission. And this is one mistake that the Bush administration must correct, if not for ourselves, but for future generations who deserve the opportunity to look back on Earth Day 2004 from the perspective of a cleaner and stronger environment.

Both Earth Day and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) were born in 1970, created from the need to clean up and protect our environment. While Earth Day draws public awareness, EPA is the federal agency ultimately responsible for the day-to-day protection of our environment. On this Earth Day, I think it fitting to examine the way the Bush Administration is undermining EPA's years of hard-won achievements in carrying out and enforcing our nation's bipartisan environmental laws.

EPA's mission is to, "protect human health and safeguard the natural environment—air, water, and land . . ." The Bush Administration is retreating from EPA's mission and instead making politically driven decisions that benefit polluters at the expense of the American public. At a time when we should be strength-

ening our environmental protections, the Bush Administration has taken steps to weaken our environmental protections and the enforcement of our existing environmental laws.

There seems to be a three-step plan from this Administration: try to pass weak environmental legislation, seek to weaken agency regulations and if all else fails, cut the enforcement budget to disable agency compliance efforts.

A quick review of the Administration's failure to clean up air pollution highlights the trend.

EPA should be taking action to clean up mercury pollution from power plants, but the Bush Administration has failed to do so. Mercury pollution has poisoned the fish in millions of acres of our lakes and thousands of miles of our streams. According to EPA scientists, approximately 630,000 infants are born in the United States each year with blood mercury levels at an unsafe level.

As required by the Clean Air Act, in December 2000, EPA determined that it was appropriate and necessary to regulate mercury emissions from power plants, the single largest source of mercury in the United States. In December 2003, when EPA released its proposal for controlling mercury, it was shockingly inadequate. The Clean Air Act requires a much larger reduction in mercury pollution, in much less time, than EPA's proposal.

Tellingly, this proposal is exactly what the power industry wanted. In fact, parts of the Administration's mercury proposal were literally copied from memos prepared by industry lobbyists. Last month's Los Angeles Times article revealed that EPA staff were told not to perform studies on the costs and public health benefits of more stringent mercury reduction proposals even though such studies were requested by the expert panel tasked with recommending an appropriate regulation. Also shocking is that the White House apparently made considerable changes to EPA's mercury proposal before its release, minimizing the health risks of mercury exposure.

In addition, the Bush Administration has failed to require power plants to install modern pollution controls. In August 2003, EPA finalized a rule that significantly weakens the Clean Air Act by allowing thousands of old power plants to make upgrades to their plants without installing pollution controls. If EPA's rule stands up to current legal challenges, these power plants and factories will be allowed to continue polluting the air with no responsibility for the resulting damage to the American people. According to technical studies using EPA models, the result will be at least 4,300 premature deaths and at least 80,000 asthma attacks each year that could otherwise be prevented by simply requiring modern pollution controls.

EPA should be taking action to address global warming but the Bush Administration has refused to address this important issue. A report by the U.S. National Research Council, commissioned by the Bush Administration, confirmed that greenhouse gases are increasing the temperatures of the earth's air and oceans, primarily caused by human activity. There is overwhelming evidence that greenhouse gases must be reduced in order to slow global warming.

Yet, in March 2001, the Bush Administration refused to take any responsibility for reducing global warming when it rejected the Kyoto Protocol. The Administration then announced

last summer that EPA does not have the authority to regulate carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, reversing a Bush campaign promise and a legal opinion issued by the EPA General Counsel under the Clinton Administration.

Rather than taking real action, the Bush Administration's answer to air pollution has been to introduce its so-called "Clear Skies" initiative, which environmental experts say would actually result in weaker standards for controlling pollution from power plants than fully enforcing existing law.

Bruce Buckheit, former Director of EPA's Air Enforcement Division, states he is, "deeply troubled by the current state of federal environmental enforcement," and noted the program is now "on life support."

"Commencing with the creation of the Office of Enforcement and Compliance in 1994 and accelerating in the 1996–2000 timeframe," Mr. Buckheit said, "EPA was building a robust enforcement program that targeted and prosecuted the most serious environmental scoff-laws. . . . These violations involved significant unlawful emissions with identifiable adverse health impacts. Appropriate resolution of these violations would result in a reduction in national pollution levels—not by a few tons—but by several million tons per year and save thousands of lives each year."

"We were embarked on a vigorous program that was beginning to show results," Mr. Buckheit said. "Within 90 days of the departure of the prior Administration, the Bush Administration began transmitting a clear message to industry that there was a new Sheriff in town—a Sheriff that did not intend to prosecute these kinds of cases."

The Administration's failure to enforce environmental laws extends beyond the Clean Air Act. EPA's own research shows that polluters are egregiously violating the Clean Water Act. According to EPA data, 60 percent of large facilities across the country exceeded their Clean Water Act permit at least once between January of 2002 and June of 2003. Large facilities that exceed their permits are dumping, on average, six times more pollution into our waterways than what they are allowed. In spite of these facts, EPA's enforcement of the Clean Water Act is declining.

For fiscal year 2005, the Administration proposes cutting EPA's overall budget by \$606 million. This will result in over 2,600 fewer inspections for violations of the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and other environmental laws than were conducted in fiscal year 2000.

I commend EPA's dedicated professionals who have, through hard work, made significant progress in cleaning up air and water pollution. Unfortunately, I believe the Bush Administration is undermining the ability of EPA staff to do their jobs effectively. As Mr. Buckheit notes, EPA employees are ready and willing to enforce the law but "the White House will not tolerate more than tokenism when it comes to environmental law enforcement."

The Bush Administration continues to put the interests of polluters first, undercutting EPA's tools for protecting our air, water, and land. The federal government owes a responsibility to all Americans to strengthen, not weaken, our environment. We must take action to clean up air and water pollution and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. EPA must

be empowered—and provided the resources—to carry out its mission. Future generation deserve the opportunity to look back at Earth Day 2004 from the perspective of a cleaner and stronger environment.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2004 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2004 THROUGH FY 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2004 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 501 of the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 (H. Con. Res. 95). This status report is current through April 9, 2004.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does now show budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2008, because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal years 2004 through 2008. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. A separate allocation for the Medicare program, as established under section 401(a)(3) of the budget resolution, is shown for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal years 2004 through 2013. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2004 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary

budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This table also compares the current level of total discretionary appropriations with the section 302(a) allocation for the Appropriations Committee. These comparisons are needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach either the section 302(a) allocation or the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The last table gives the current level for 2005 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 501 of H. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 501 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriations bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2004 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 95

(Reflecting action completed as of April 9, 2004—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal years—	
	2004	2004–2008
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	1,880,555	(¹)
Outlays	1,903,502	(¹)
Revenues	1,325,452	8,168,933
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,877,536	(¹)
Outlays	1,893,542	(¹)
Revenues	1,334,119	8,383,689
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate level:		
Budget authority	– 3,019	(¹)
Outlays	– 7,954	(¹)
Revenues	8,667	214,756

¹ = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2005 through 2008 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2004 in excess of \$3,019,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2004 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2004 in excess of \$7,954,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2004 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in revenue reduction for FY 2004 in excess of \$8,667,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period FY 2004 through 2008 in excess of \$214,756,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION
COMPLETED AS OF APRIL 9, 2004

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	2004		2004–2008 Total		2004–2013 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
House Committee:						
Agriculture:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Current Level	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Difference	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Armed Services:						
Allocation	70	34	70	70	(1)	(1)
Current Level	3,818	354	15,168	12,755	(1)	(1)
Difference	3,748	320	15,098	12,685	(1)	(1)
Education and the Workforce:						
Allocation	39	47	201	245	(1)	(1)
Current Level	15	14	332	332	(1)	(1)
Difference	–24	–33	131	87	(1)	(1)
Energy and Commerce:						
Allocation	–170	–170	439	439	(1)	(1)
Current Level	2,202	963	3,451	3,567	(1)	(1)
Difference	2,372	1,133	3,012	3,128	(1)	(1)
Financial Services:						
Allocation	0	375	0	1,250	(1)	(1)
Current Level	–1	–1	–2	–2	(1)	(1)
Difference	–1	–376	–2	–1,252	(1)	(1)
Government Reform:						
Allocation	–1	0	–3	–1	(1)	(1)
Current Level	2	2	24	24	(1)	(1)
Difference	3	2	27	25	(1)	(1)
House Administration:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Current Level	1	1	3	3	(1)	(1)
Difference	1	1	3	3	(1)	(1)
International Relations:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Current Level	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Difference	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Judiciary:						
Allocation	19	19	95	95	(1)	(1)
Current Level	13	13	83	83	(1)	(1)
Difference	–6	–6	–12	–12	(1)	(1)
Resources:						
Allocation	24	24	522	342	(1)	(1)
Current Level	28	28	165	165	(1)	(1)
Difference	4	4	–357	–177	(1)	(1)
Science:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Current Level	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Difference	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Small Business:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Current Level	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Difference	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Transportation and Infrastructure:						
Allocation	9,256	0	41,134	0	(1)	(1)
Current Level	7,753	–2	8,788	–126	(1)	(1)
Difference	–1,503	–2	–32,346	–126	(1)	(1)
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	(1)	(1)
Current Level	–77	–77	–1	–1	(1)	(1)
Difference	–77	–77	–1	–1	(1)	(1)
Ways and Means:						
Allocation	20,626	20,054	24,079	23,876	(1)	(1)
Current Level	18,771	18,703	23,503	23,538	(1)	(1)
Difference	–1,855	–1,351	–576	–338	(1)	(1)
Medicare:						
Allocation	0	0	(1)	(1)	0	0
Current Level	4,100	3,100	(1)	(1)	392,000	392,000
Difference	4,100	3,100	(1)	(1)	392,000	392,000

¹ Nonapplicable.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of July 22, 2003 (H. Rpt. 108–228)		Current level reflecting action completed as of April 9, 2004		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development	17,005	17,686	16,839	17,633	–166	–53
Commerce, Justice, State	37,914	41,009	37,582	40,677	–332	–332
National Defense	368,662	389,221	368,183	388,648	–479	–573
District of Columbia	466	464	542	536	76	72
Energy & Water Development	27,080	27,211	27,255	27,263	175	52
Foreign Operations	17,120	20,185	17,611	20,171	491	–14
Homeland Security	29,411	30,506	29,238	30,007	–173	–499
Interior	19,627	19,400	19,540	19,346	–87	–54
Labor, HHS & Education	138,036	134,766	138,987	135,069	951	303
Legislative Branch	3,512	3,662	3,527	3,603	15	–59
Military Construction	9,196	10,282	9,316	10,247	120	–35
Transportation—Treasury	27,502	71,360	28,116	71,873	614	513
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies	90,034	95,590	90,774	96,404	740	814
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	785,565	861,342	787,510	861,477	1,945	135

Statement of FY2005 advance appropriations under section 501 of H. Con. Res. 95, reflecting action completed as of April 9, 2004

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriate Level Budget authority 23,158

Current Level:

Homeland Security Subcommittee:

Bioshield¹ 2,528

Interior Subcommittee

Elk Hills 36

Budget authority

Budget authority

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee:

Employment and Training Administration 2,463

Education for Disadvantaged

School Improvement 7,383

1,435

<i>Budget authority</i>	
Children and Family Services (head start)	1,400
Special Education	5,413
Vocational and Adult Education	791
Transportation and Treasury Subcommittee:	
Payment to Postal Service	37
Veterans, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee: Section 8 Renewals	4,200
Total	25,686
Current Level over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level	2,528

¹ This advance appropriation was not on the list of accounts identified for advance appropriations included in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference in the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 95. Still, since the provision has been enacted, it is included part of the current level for advance appropriations.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 20, 2004.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2004 budget and is current through April 9, 2004. This report submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004. The budget resolution figures incorporate revisions submitted by the Committee on the Budget to the House to reflect funding for the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003, and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003. These revisions are authorized by sections 421 and 507 of H. Con. Res. 95, respectively.

Since my last letter, dated February 12, 2004, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts, which changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues for 2004:

The Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-202);

The Social Security Protection Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-203);

The Welfare Reform Extension Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-210);

An act to reauthorize certain school lunch and child nutrition programs through June 30, 2004 (Public Law 108-211); and

The Pension Funding Equity Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-213).

In addition, the Congress has cleared the following legislation for the President's signature:

An act to require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse members of the United States Armed Forces for certain transportation expenses (S. 2057).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN,
Director.

FISCAL YEAR 2004 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF APRIL 9, 2004

[in millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,330,756
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,120,639	1,081,373	n.a.
Appropriation legislation ¹	1,145,398	1,178,431	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	–368,484	–368,484	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions:	1,897,533	1,891,320	1,330,756
Enacted this session:			
Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-202)	1,328	0	0
Social Security Protection Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-203)	685	685	0
Welfare Reform Extension Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-210)	107	58	0
An act to reauthorize certain school lunch and child nutrition programs through June 30, 2004 (P.L. 108-211)	6	6	0
Pension Funding Equity Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-213)	0	0	3,363
Total, enacted this session:	2,126	749	3,363
Passed, pending signature:			
An act to require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse members of the United States Armed Forces for certain transportation expenses (S. 2057)	13	7	0
Entitlements and mandates: Difference between enacted levels and budget resolution estimates for appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	–22,156	3,472	n.a.
Total Current Level^{1,2}	1,877,536	1,895,548	1,334,119
Total Budget Resolution	1,880,555	1,903,502	1,325,452
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	8,667
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	3,019	7,954	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2004–2008:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	8,383,689
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	8,168,933
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	214,756

¹ Pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes budget authority of \$86,004 and outlays of \$38,056 from previously enacted bills.

² For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the budget resolution does not include Social Security administrative expenses, which are off-budget. As a result, the current level excludes these items.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

MISLEADING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to express my concern that the administration has misled Congress and the American public on the most pressing issues we are facing here at home and abroad. It is time that the administration was truthful to the American public about the cost of the war in Iraq.

Last week President Bush said in his address to the Nation that the administration is constantly reviewing the needs of our troops and will provide whatever additional resources are needed. Yet this is the same administration that sent our troops to war without adequate body armor, antijamming devices or armored Humvees. Our troops in the theater did

not even have enough body armor and protective SAPI plates until January of 2004.

As of today less than 50 percent of the 12,800 armored Humvees that we need in Iraq and Afghanistan are equipped with reinforced doors and windows. This is in part because the \$87 billion supplemental for the Iraq war that Congress passed last November included only \$239 million to up-armor Humvees, far short of what is needed.

I supported a substitute version proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that would have provided \$3 billion to reinforce Humvees and other unarmored vehicles used by our forces. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership refused to allow the House a vote to consider the Obey proposal. Is it not ironic that anyone who did not vote for this \$87 billion package, they say, you are against anything for the troops, when it truth they orchestrated the

vote so those of us who want to provide more funding for the troops to provide them with the up-armored Humvees were not allowed a vote. Clearly the funding for upgrades to the Humvees and other force protection initiatives have been inadequate.

On March 18, 2004, the Defense Department formally requested Congress to shift \$190 million previously allocated to other uses to cover the cost of armoring Humvees for fiscal year 2004. According to the defense expert Michael O'Hanlon at the Brookings Institution, simply maintaining current troops levels beyond June could add nearly \$4 billion in unfunded costs through the end of this year. Yet President Bush's \$521 billion defense budget for fiscal year 2005 includes no money, no money for military operations in Iraq or Afghanistan.

In fact, there are \$12 billion worth of unfunded requirements for the military, including nearly \$2 billion of important force protection initiatives. And the administration says it will wait until next year to request a new supplemental, which could amount to over \$50 billion. The question is, why did not they not include this in their regular fiscal 2005 defense budget?

I think the American people deserve answers. The American people also deserve answers about urgent health problems here at home, health care and the rising costs of prescription drugs. The American people deserve to know the truth about the new Medicare prescription bill law. I have been having town meetings throughout my district with seniors, and they are outraged at the new Medicare law because it falls far short of what they expected, of what they need, and what they deserve.

The new law does nothing to reduce the cost of drugs, and it actually raises costs for seniors with less than \$5,000 a year in prescriptions.

□ 2015

It jeopardizes existing health benefits for retirees. The new Medicare prescription drug law was a huge victory for the pharmaceutical industry because it fails to require the government to negotiate drug prices on behalf of seniors, and it continues to make reimportation illegal.

Seniors are still prohibited from ordering prescription drugs from Canada at a fraction of the cost for those same drugs here in the United States. In the last 9 months, Springfield, Massachusetts, has already saved \$2 million by buying prescription drugs from Canada for their city's employees and retirees.

So instead of working to improve the Medicare prescription drug bill, we recently learned that the administration has chosen to hide the truth that the Medicare law would cost \$139 billion more than the Congressional Budget Office's prediction. We need to work together to pass a prescription drug law that will allow Medicare to negotiate lower drug costs on behalf of America's seniors, that will allow Americans to pay lower costs for drugs in Canada.

I have to tell my colleagues, whether I am talking to seniors who are Republicans, seniors who are Democrats, or seniors who are Independents, they do not get it. They understand that if you do not buy prescription drugs for all the 40 million recipients of Medicare, then it is probably not going to be a good deal for seniors; and they want this bill changed.

EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, with the approach this week of Earth Day, that will soon be followed by a

flood of American planners coming into our city for their annual conference, I think it is an appropriate time for us to step back and think about what the Federal Government can do to make a difference for our environment.

With the help of those people who are involved with the planning community looking in the long term, there are a number of things we can do that are simple, commonsense, that will make our communities more livable, enhance the environment and, at the same time, create real value for American families.

The most important single step that we could undertake would be just for the Federal Government to model the behavior that we expect from the rest of America, whether it is local government, business, or individuals.

A simple proposition: let us have the Federal Government clean up after itself. In just one area, that of the Department of Defense, we do not know how many millions of acres are polluted with military toxins and unexploded ordnance. The estimates range from 10 million acres to 50 million acres or more; and at the rate we are going, it is going to take us hundreds of years to meet the Federal Government's obligation to clean up these messes; and at the rate we are going, frankly, we are creating more problems than we are cleaning up.

At a time when we are contemplating this next year giving the Department of Defense over \$1 million a minute, it would seem to be a simple environmental expedient to give the men and women in uniform the tools to be able to do what they are equipped to do and what they want to do, which is leave the environment better than they found it. As the largest manager of infrastructure in the world, as the largest creator of Superfund sites in the United States, it would seem only right.

I have been profoundly impressed by the ability of men and women in the armed services to identify these problems; and when given the tools and the resources, they can solve any problem. Look what has happened in Iraq in terms of moving forward. I think our only problem there is we have not given the right tools and the right instruction, placing them in harm's way. We do not have to do that in the battle to clean up after the environment.

There is another simple step that can be taken and that is just for the Federal Government to be more environmentally sensitive to the way that it locates and manages its facilities, whether it is the post office which ought to obey local land use laws and zoning codes or it is the General Services Administration with over 300 million square feet of office scattered across the country. If the Federal Government, as the largest landlord, landowner and employer in the country, models best practices, the environments in our communities, large and small, would be better.

We have before us, pending final resolution, a transportation bill that has passed both the House and the Senate, albeit at different levels; and sadly, there were a few items that got shoe-horned into the transportation bill at the last minute in the House, a few bridges to nowhere, so to speak; but the vast majority of that legislation provides an important environmental framework for protecting land, for repairing crumbling infrastructure, to be able to strengthen communities and put thousands and thousands of people to work by Labor Day in every State across the country.

When it comes to energy, we are watching in our service stations every day it seems like that prices are going higher, \$2, \$2.25 a gallon. The American public understands that simple, commonsense, fuel efficiency improvements that have been mandated in the past, that this Congress and administration have refused to embrace for the future, would make a huge difference. Simply improving our fuel efficiency to the same level as American companies are doing to compete in the European market would enable us to save more gasoline than we would recover from the arctic wildlife refuge which most Americans know is the last place we ought to be drilling, rather than the first.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that Congress, in the weeks ahead, would focus on simple, commonsense steps to improve the environment. That is the single most important thing we can do to keep our commitments to Americans on Earth Day, making our communities more livable, our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DOSAN AHN CHANG HO POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1822 would designate that a United States Post Office in the Koreatown section of my district would be renamed the "Dosan Ahn Chang Ho Post Office."

Los Angeles is the home to the largest Korean American population in the country. In fact, more people of Korean heritage live and work in Los Angeles than any place outside of Korea. LA's Koreatown neighborhood is the epicenter of that community, and the economic and cultural wealth of this area are testaments to the achievements of Korean Americans.

It is fitting to mark these achievements by naming this post office after

a man who is possibly the most celebrated Korean American of them all. Ahn Chang Ho, often known by the name of Dosan or Iron Mountain, is credited by many as being the spiritual father of modern, independent and democratic Korea. His vision is what guides the Korean people to this day, first to free themselves from foreign occupation and now to unite Koreans in one unified, peaceful, and democratic nation.

Today, Korean Americans honor Dosan Ahn Chang Ho for his contributions to the Korean nation, but all Americans can take pride in the fact that much of Dosan's vision of Korean democracy was formed by his encounters with American democracy.

Ahn Chang Ho came to the United States in 1902 and stayed more than a decade. During this time, he worked tirelessly to unite the Korean community, founding schools and cultural organizations and helping to improve living and working conditions for his fellow Korean Americans; and along the way, he emerged as the spiritual leader of the Korean independence movement.

Dosan was not the only advocate for Korean independence at that time, but Dosan's values and approach were what set him apart. He was concerned not just with the means of achieving independence, but in educating Koreans in democratic governance and civic virtue, to ensure that independence would endure.

I am proud that I sponsored this bill on behalf of the Korean American community in my district. Dosan Ahn Chang Ho is not only a symbol of Korean success in America. He is also a symbol of the shared experience and shared democratic values of all Koreans and all Americans.

SMART SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a new SMART approach to national security, an approach that emphasizes brains instead of brawn, one that is consistent with American values.

Talk about mistakes. It has been 1 year since the President of the United States, without just cause, or, in fact, being provoked, invaded Iraq. Hundreds of Americans have given their lives for this war, not to mention the thousands wounded, the billions of dollars spent, and the international goodwill squandered.

We were told that this war was necessary to keep us safe. We were told Saddam Hussein had the world's most dangerous weapons aimed at American cities. Now even the President makes tacky jokes about looking for the missing weapons of mass destruction under his sofa.

We were told by the administration that Saddam was in cahoots with al

Qaeda. Now Richard Clark tells us that invading Iraq in response to 9/11 was as senseless as it would have been if FDR had attacked Mexico in response to Pearl Harbor.

The President's national security policy is not just immoral. It is incompetent. There has to be a better way and there is.

I have introduced legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism, and it has five major components.

In the first section, we address preventing future acts of terrorism. SMART security is more vigilant than the President on fighting terror; but instead of military force, SMART emphasizes multilateral partnerships and stronger intelligence capabilities to track and detain terrorists.

Second, we need to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction; and we can do it with aggressive diplomacy, a commitment to nuclear nonproliferation, strong regional security arrangements, and vigorous inspection regimes.

Third, we must address terrorism's root causes. The first front in the war on terror has to be confronting the despair and deprivation that foster it. That is why SMART security includes an ambitious international development agenda: democracy-building, human rights education, and sustainable development and education for women and girls in oppressive nations. Instead of troops, let's send scientists, teachers, urban planners, agricultural experts, and small business loans to troubled parts of the world.

Fourth, let us rethink our budget priorities. We need stronger investments in peacekeeping and reconstruction, less spending on missile defense and outdated Cold War systems, a more serious financial commitment to homeland security and first responders, and a real strategy for energy independence, especially support for the development of renewable energy sources, because nothing threatens national security more than reliance on Middle Eastern oil.

Fifth, and the final section of the SMART security platform, stresses that the United States must pursue to the fullest extent alternatives to war. SMART security calls for prevention over preemption. War should be the very last resort to be considered, only after every single diplomatic solution has been exhausted.

The SMART legislation promotes more effective conflict assessment in early warning systems, multilateral rapid response mechanisms, human rights monitoring, civilian policing, and investments in civil society programs and fair judicial systems.

□ 2030

Keeping Americans safe must be the Federal Government's most urgent priority. On that point, the President and

I agree. But his mistake is in equating security with aggression and military force. In fact, his appetite for belligerence and bloodshed only weakens us and makes us more vulnerable, encouraging further violence and increasing the risk of nuclear destruction.

And while we are at it, maybe we ought to expand our definition of national security. Can a Nation whose public schools fail its poor children and leave more than 40 million of its people without health coverage truly be considered secure? The Bush doctrine has been tried, and it has failed. It is time for a new national security strategy.

Smart security defends America by relying on the very best of America: Our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity to work with leadership around the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, as we meet tonight, this country, our government, is headed towards a deficit of \$521 billion. That is not my estimate, that is the estimate of the Office of Management and Budget, the President's own budget shop. We have watched the initial returns from April 15 come in to see if there might be a revenue surprise, a bounce that will alleviate this problem, and thus far there is no early indication that there are any surprises coming. We are stuck with a \$521 billion deficit this year.

Now, that would be bad by itself, \$521 billion is a record deficit, but it is worse when you put it in context. Our budget, the budget of the United States, was in surplus by the amount of \$236 billion as recently as the year 2000; in surplus by \$127 billion in the year 2001, when Mr. Bush came to office. Indeed, he inherited a fiscal situation unlike any President who has taken office in recent years, yet now we find ourselves, 3 to 4 years later, in deficit by \$521 billion.

The administration portrays itself as the hapless victim of circumstance. In truth, it is a victim of policies that it itself has chosen. It is a victim of the consequences of these policies which it has freely put in place against the warnings which they failed to heed on all sides. What we have had to witness here is painful for those of us who have

committed our careers in the Congress, and I have been here for nearly 22 years, to putting the budget in balance and institutionalizing conservative fiscal policy. We have been forced to witness 15 years of fiscal discipline, 15 years during which we took a deficit of \$290 billion and moved it into surplus, become this huge deficit in just the last 3 years.

As Yogi Berra used to like to say, you can look it up. This is a matter of historic record. Every year during the Clinton administration, for 8 straight years, the bottom line of the budget got better. It moved out of deficit into surplus. Every year for 8 straight years it got better. Every year, for the last 4 years, the bottom line of the Bush administration's budget has gotten worse and worse and worse, until we now find ourselves with a budget deficit of over \$520 billion this year.

The Congressional Budget Office took the President's budget in February of this year, as they are required to do, and in March they sent us their analysis of that budget. They told the Congress that if we adopt and implement the President's budget as he has proposed it, then over the next 10 years the Federal Government will accumulate \$5.132 trillion of additional debt to be added to the \$7.4 trillion of debt we already have, and in which case we will leave our children a negative legacy of unheralded, unprecedented proportion. We will be \$13 trillion in debt on top of a Social Security program that is underfunded and on top of a Medicare program which is even more underfunded.

Now, just as a preface to other remarks that other Members are going to make, let me give a quick summary of where we are. This was the surplus that was projected for this year, \$397 billion, only 3 years ago. This is what CBO says it is going to be: \$477 billion. If you want to see a roller coaster ride, here it is: \$290 billion. That is the deficit the Clinton administration inherited. They turned it, through 8 years of fiscal discipline and unrelenting attention to the deficit, which is one of the top priorities of the government, to a surplus of \$236 billion, the largest in the Nation's history.

This is what has happened since Mr. Bush came to office: A precipitous decline from a surplus of \$236 billion to a deficit of \$477 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office. And here is the dire prediction for the future: There will be a little bounce, a little uptick due to the economy, but the prediction of the Congressional Budget Office is that these numbers will only deteriorate over time.

We developed during the 1990s a series of budget process rules that helped us bring to heel these deficits, diminishing every year and moving the budget so into surplus. They were embodied in an act called the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. A lot of people scoffed at this. I was here. They said Congress is dodging the problem again. They are coming up with procedural rules in-

stead of substantive changes in the budget. But two of the rules we adopted were of signal success. One was a rule called PAYGO, which I will come back to in just a minute. The other was a rule called discretionary spending caps.

In effect, what we did was impose a numeric or dollar cap every year for 5 successive fiscal years on discretionary spending, the amount of money that we appropriate every year in 13 different appropriation bills. That is different from entitlement spending, which is mandatory spending and is not changed annually. The discretionary spending caps were imposed in 1990 in an agreement we made with the current President Bush's father and reimposed in 1993. When President Clinton came in, a new set of numbers was imposed as our targets, or mandatory ceiling on spending, and then finally in 1997 they were extended once again. They worked.

But there was another rule that worked even more significantly, and that was the PAYGO rule. The PAYGO rule simply stipulated this: It provided that if any Member of the House or any committee wanted to increase an entitlement, then it had to be paid for. That simple. It had to be paid for, or another entitlement had to be cut by a commensurate amount so that the effect of that enhancement in benefits was neutral upon the deficit, the bottom line of the budget.

By the same token, the PAYGO rule applied to taxes, and tax cuts in particular. And what it provided was that if you want to bring a tax cut to the floor of the House while we have a budget deep in deficit, then it cannot have an impact upon the deficit and make the deficit worsen. You must do one of two things: You must either identify another tax increase to offset your tax decrease, or take some permanent spending, entitlement spending, and cut it by an amount over 5 years equal to the amount of our revenue reduction affected by the tax cut. That was the so-called PAYGO spending rule.

We are going to talk about that tonight, because one of the bones of contention right now in the budget resolution conference, which is ongoing, is whether or not we should take those rules, which were developed and successfully employed in the 1990s, to the extent that we put the budget back in surplus, take them in the form that they were proposed and used in the past, or whether we will take some faint facsimile of those rules and impose it.

In particular, when the House passed the Republican resolution several weeks ago, they included in it the recommendation that a PAYGO rule be reinstated, but it was a one-edge PAYGO rule. It applied only to entitlement increases. It did not apply to tax cuts. Even though an entitlement increase has the same impact as a tax cut upon the bottom line of the budget, the tax

cut aspect was left out. So it is half a loaf, half a bill, and half a rule.

One of the reasons that the budget resolution is stuck in conference right now is that there are others in the other body who disagree with that position, who realize that we have an intractable problem on our hands, and apt to get worse unless we do something dramatic and develop a plan to deal with it. For starters, we have two proven rules, rules that worked in the 1990s, a PAYGO rule being one of them, and there are lots of us who would like to impose those rules again so we can begin attacking this horrendous problem.

And not just for our generation. No, the real problem of the deficits occurring today are for our children and grandchildren, because we are shoving off onto them the debt with a budget that we will not fully fund ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for comments along the lines of the PAYGO rule and other aspects of the budget.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for allowing me to speak on this very critical issue. As he well knows, I voted for the first Bush tax cut, and I voted to eliminate estate taxes and to eliminate the marriage penalty tax, so I am hardly opposed to cutting taxes. But I do rise tonight to voice my strong objections to the Republican budget, which threatens increased deficits and neglects many of our Nation's top priorities in favor of continued and irresponsible tax cuts.

The President and the Republican leaders of the House talk about their commitment to reducing the deficit and the tax burdens on families, protecting the security of our Nation, guarding the Social Security Trust Fund and improving the health care and education systems in this country. However, when it comes to funding these important initiatives, their words are simply not supported by their deeds.

The 2005 Republican budget proposal is reckless, in my opinion, fiscally irresponsible, and filled with misguided budget priorities. Let me give some examples.

The Republican budget drastically cuts nearly all domestic programs after 2005, an interesting date since the election is 2004, including cuts to critical education and training programs, health care and environmental programs, and veterans' medical programs. Additionally, we are a country at war, yet in his budget the President provides no funding for the war in Iraq. This simply defies logic.

This Nation has gone from a projected \$5.6 trillion surplus in 2001 to a projected \$2.9 trillion deficit in 2011, as the gentleman so eloquently stated in his opening remarks. This year's deficit is fast approaching \$500 billion and will only continue to grow under the GOP budget.

Ultimately it is our American families that are going to pay now and will continue to pay for this administration's fiscal irresponsibility. American baby boomers and retirees will suffer greatly under this Republican budget. The Republican proposal spends the entire \$1 trillion Social Security surplus from 2005 to 2009 by creating additional and unwise tax cuts. The total cost of the Republicans' latest tax cut is more than enough to make up for the Social Security and Medicare solvency for the next 75 years.

Foolish spending threatens the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of retirees in my home State of Nevada and millions of retirees across America, not to mention the financial security of future generations. But as my colleague from South Carolina knows, perhaps the most egregious cut of all are the cuts in funds to our veterans' programs.

As thousands of brave men and women are fighting for this country in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and elsewhere abroad, it is outrageous that the Republican budget calls for cuts in funding for veterans' programs.

□ 2045

Mr. Speaker, the House Republican budget provides \$1.3 billion less than what the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on which I serve has determined is needed just to maintain vital health care programs for our veterans. All of these cuts are certain to result in decreased spending on long-term care programs, which veterans in Las Vegas and throughout the country depend on. Many aging veterans in Las Vegas require more care than their families can provide. Our veterans must know that they can count on our VA to supply the care they have earned through their military service.

Those on the front line who are sacrificing their personal safety should not have to worry that the VA budget cuts will deny them the quality health care they need and deserve. We must send them a message that we are indebted to their sacrifices and that we remain committed to our promises to increase funding levels to meet their needs in Las Vegas and throughout the Nation.

We have all heard Republicans talk about their commitment to education. Yet their budget provides \$8.8 billion less than what is authorized for education programs in the Leave No Child Behind Act. This lack of funding will mean cuts in such vital initiatives like drop-out prevention programs and after-school programs. These programs are especially important to my district and the community of Las Vegas that I represent because we have one of the highest dropout rates in the Nation.

Republicans also shortchange higher education in their budget. The Republicans propose to freeze the Pell grant award level for the third year in a row, making the dream of higher education unattainable for thousands of lower- and middle-income students. These are

the very people that I represent. They are first generation college goers who want to go to Nevada colleges and universities, and they cannot afford it without Pell grants.

Families in Las Vegas and across the country will receive little assistance in obtaining health care coverage under this budget. The Republican plan forces severe cuts in the Medicaid program, shifting most of the cost of Medicaid onto the States, many of which are already, like the State of Nevada, facing their own fiscal crises. In Nevada, this shift would result in children, the disabled, and families being cut out of the Medicare rolls, as well as reduce benefits and increase cost-sharing for those who need the assistance the most.

The Republican budget also cuts training for nurses. Without adequate training for nurses, Nevada, which has the lowest ratio of nurses to the population, will be unable to hire the trained nurses needed to provide quality care. But despite all of our needs, despite the cuts in education and veterans benefits and health care, all of the issues that make quality of life in this Nation, and certainly in my communities, important, the President has called for a nearly \$900 million increase in funding for the Yucca Mountain project, which will result in 77,000 tons of toxic nuclear waste being dumped in Nevada less than 90 miles from Las Vegas.

The President's call for this additional funding flies in the face of his repeated promises to protect the security of the United States here at home in the wake of September 11. Under the Yucca Mountain project, thousands of shipments of nuclear waste would cross this Nation on their way to Nevada. One terrorist attack on a shipment could unleash high-level nuclear waste, the most deadly substance known to man, potentially threatening lives and causing billions of dollars in environmental damage.

The Republican budget is a blueprint for disaster. While the President and the Republican majority talk a good game, our veterans and our students and teachers and police officers and fire fighters, our nurses and our seniors will all suffer as a result of the misplaced priorities inherent in this 2005 Republican budget.

When I came to Congress, I came to represent the people of southern Nevada. If we do not speak up and if the rest of Congress does not join you in this clarion call to take another look at this budget and do what is right by our American citizens, who will speak out for them? I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for sharing with the American public exactly what is going on in this Chamber and hopefully changing minds so we can get some fiscal responsibility and do what is right for the people we represent.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the people of South Carolina are well served by

the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for the clarity that he brings to this debate on the budget, a far cry, I might say, from what our friends on the majority side of the aisle have been doing.

When we start talking about PAYGO rules, it may sound technical and difficult to understand, but it really is not: pay as you go. It is very simple. Everyone should be able to get this.

The rules that were in effect from 1990 to 2002 provided if a Member of Congress wanted to increase spending on a certain item, then he would have to decrease spending on another item or have a tax increase to pay for what he wanted to do. If, on the other hand, a Member of Congress wanted to propose a tax cut, he would have to at the same time reduce spending or he would have to increase some other form of taxes. Very simple, pay as you go.

It should not be hard, but the Republicans here have done something quite astonishing. They used to claim they were fiscal conservatives, and they still do, but they clearly are not because they have forgotten the basic connection between expenditures and revenues, between money coming in and money going out. Every American knows this relationship. In our personal budgets, we have money coming in and we have money going out. The money that we spend on things, they have to be in balance, or we wind up in great trouble. Everyone who has a business of any size knows you have money coming in and you have money going out, and they have to be in balance.

Only here in Washington does the Republican majority suggest that the revenues, the money coming in, do not matter. You do not even have to think about that; all you have to focus on is spending. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has a chart that shows that spending as a percentage of our gross domestic product actually remains low compared to the past; but it is receipts, tax revenues, that have declined so dramatically.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, this is a bit difficult to follow, but once you understand it, it is a very graphic chart.

Basically what this shows is in the red line at the top is a course of outlays from the 1980s through the current period, 2004. What Members see here is when President Clinton came to office in 1992-1993, spending was at 22.5 percent of our gross domestic product. Federal spending constituted 22.5 percent of our GDP. That is about the point at which President Clinton came to office, and this may be a surprise to some people, but because of budget discipline, because of PAYGO, because of the discretionary spending caps, two different budget plans in 1993 and 1997, every year outlays came down. At the same time, we enhanced revenues. That is the politically polite way to put it. We increased the revenues to the government. They came up. At the point at which they crossed as a percentage

of GDP, you have balance for the first time in 30 years because we worked on both sides of the ledger, adding revenues, holding back spending. We had a balanced budget for the first time in 30 years.

CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, was to look back on this period with some astonishment and appreciation and say 48 percent of the success achieved in eradicating the budget deficit during the 1990s was due to revenue increases, 52 percent was due to spending curbs, cuts, and decreases. There we have it right there.

Outlays continued to go down, and receipts continued to come up; and the difference between the two right there is the surplus that we had in the year 2000, \$236 billion. But the blue line here, receipts plummeted with the tax cuts. The recession, plus the tax cuts, caused receipts to plummet while spending went up. We have the exact opposite of what we need in fiscal policy in order to bring or keep the budget in balance. We have increasing expenditures and decreasing revenues.

The Cato Foundation, which is probably the most conservative think tank in the United States, certainly in Washington, D.C., the Cato Group has said the Bush administration has succeeded in creating a fundamental mismatch at the base of our budget. They say we have Big Government spending and Little Government revenues, and the result is the deficit.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has a chart projecting future years, but one thing that is striking about the first 3 years of the Bush administration is outlays. Spending, has risen from 18.5 percent of gross domestic product up to over 20 percent of gross domestic product. So there has been an explosion in spending. At the same time, there has been a dramatic reduction in revenues. They have fallen from roughly 20 percent of gross domestic product down to about 16 percent of gross domestic product.

In fact, today, as we stand here today, Federal revenues as a percentage of our economy, Federal revenues as a percentage of our gross domestic product are at the lowest level since 1950, and there are Republicans in this Chamber who will say the problem is spending, but revenues are at the lowest level since 1950.

I would like to close with a quotation from the majority leader. He had a press conference 2 or 3 weeks ago, and he finally revealed in all of its confusion the underlying Republican philosophy and I use the word not information, not evidence, but philosophy. Here is what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said: "We, as a matter of philosophy, understand that when you cut taxes, the economy grows, and revenues to the government grow. The whole notion that you have to cut spending in order to cut taxes negates that philosophy, and so I am not interested in something that would negate our philosophy."

Listen to that again: "We, as a matter of philosophy," not as a matter of economics, not as a matter of information, not as a factual matter, "We, as a matter of philosophy, understand that when you cut taxes, the economy grows, and revenues to the government grow." Not true. CBO has made it clear over and over again that when you cut taxes, you cut revenues. Only in very, very rare historical circumstances, and the Kennedy tax cut may be one of those, only in rare historical circumstances can you cut taxes substantially and have revenues to the government actually increase.

But then we have this other statement which is really revealing. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) stated: "The whole notion that you have to cut spending in order to cut taxes negates that philosophy, and so I am not interested in something that would negate our philosophy."

Mr. Speaker, I am old enough to remember "Dragnet." I am old enough to remember Jack Webb, the L.A. detective who, whenever he was interviewing someone, said, "Just the facts, ma'am. All I want is just the facts."

What the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is saying, do not bother me with the facts; I do not want to hear the facts because we have our philosophy, and our philosophy says we do not have to pay attention to the facts.

Great damage has been done to the country because the Republican majority in this House, President Bush and his Cabinet and members of the Senate, have not made economic sense. They have not paid attention to the simple fact that if we have huge tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country, we reduce government revenues and drive us into deficit, and that is what they have done to this country. They are funding these tax cuts on the backs of our children because when the revenues are way below the spending, all they do is borrow. They are borrowing from our children in order to give the richest people in this country tax cuts, and nothing can make that philosophy make any sense. It is time, frankly, it was changed.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I say with all sincerity to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), he brings a lot of common sense to this body.

Mr. Speaker, I was in business for a number of years before I came to Washington.

□ 2100

There is one thing that I learned very quickly. If we drive the debt up, soon enough we will go broke. As some of my folks at home will say, we cannot borrow ourselves rich. And we are trying to do that. And I do not think anyone in this body can believe we can keep running deficits this large.

I just ran some numbers on the material the gentleman provided us. Just

going out to 2009, in 2004 a family of four spent about \$4,380 on average in debt in this country. But by 2009 that will be \$6,985 just using the current numbers. That is assuming, Mr. Speaker, that things do not change for the worse. That is using the best numbers I understand for the economy to grow and then no more tax cuts that are proposed in the current budget or revenue losses. That is a 59 percent increase in the debt load on families.

Today I was in two schools talking with children about the importance of reading, about their future, about how important it was to do the things right to make a difference, looking into those faces and thinking what a burden we are placing on them. It is a shame because my colleague from Maine is absolutely right. We are using borrowed money from our children to enjoy the good life on a credit card; and we are taking the Social Security trust funds from the seniors who are now waiting for the benefits and using that, and between those two issues, we are living the good life and we are not paying our way. We are not paying our way. And it is wrong any way we cut it. It would be wrong if we were doing it as Democrats, and it is absolutely wrong for our Republican colleagues to stand with a straight face and say we are giving them prosperity. Because I promise this: I was in business when I remember interest rates going through the roof, and I will promise tonight that this kind of policy is going to drive interest rates up again. And all the money that we are borrowing to feed this deficit, a large portion of it is coming from overseas.

It startles me and shocks me and baffles me, too. I am not really sure the American people understand that they are going to have the Chinese setting our interest rate at some point because they are buying a lot of this debt and a lot of our trading partners around the world. And ultimately we are going to have to meet that bill. When we look at the amount of debt today without any changes and where it is going to hit, I am not sure our colleagues or the people who might be watching us tonight know what PAYGO is. They do not know what it is. But I tell the Members what they do know. They know that we cannot spend more than we have. And they understand that, as many of the farmers in the gentleman's State and my State who have seen their tobacco allotments cut in half, there is one thing they know tonight: they are not spending as much this year as they spent 5 years ago, and they are not going to spend as much next year because they are going to have to cut their spending back to meet their revenues. What our colleagues tell us is that we can have it all. We can have it all.

We cannot have it all. If we do, our children are going to be the poorer for it. And this budget, if it comes back without a plan to balance on both ends, on revenues as well as expenditures, we

are doing an injustice to ourselves but a greater injustice to our children. And those children, I looked in their faces today. That is why they tell us we cannot build schools. We do not have the money. And yet we say to these children they are the ones we are going to depend on to build a bright future we want to see in the 21st century.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention tonight and for sharing with this body and with the people around this country, because they need to understand that this plan is headed for a train wreck. It may not be this year, it may not be next year, but it is coming. We cannot keep piling on debt and not paying the bills, and that is really what is happening.

And it is amazing to me that this administration in this short period of time will increase the debt at this level and this Congress has added to it. And the majority knows they have done it. They just do not want to stand up and meet their obligations. Because higher interest rates will eat away all the benefits that middle income and others have had. We may have lower interest rates today, but we let them add two points or three points, and that will happen. It may not be this month, it may not be this year, but I guarantee it will come in the next several years.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his comments.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding. I appreciate his leading these discussions on one of the most important issues that simply does make some people's eyes glaze over; but I think he has documented simple declarative sentences, and it does not have to be this hard.

It is very clear that we are on a path here to have a massive increase in the debt tax. We are, in fact, abandoning principles that some of our friends on the other side of the aisle have in the past at least given lip service to.

I came over to the other side of the aisle this evening to see if it felt different somehow, if the numbers added up differently. They do not. I think, in fact, the information that the gentleman has gotten with his staff, and referring to accepted experts, institutes, independent analyses, suggests that even the situation that he documented a moment ago that was calculated according to the official rules that CBO has to follow actually disguises the true depth of the problem that is being created.

I wonder if the gentleman has some information about what the people who are using the artificial rules that Congress has given to CBO, assuming some of these taxes are going to be expiring and never be renewed, I wonder if he has some information that independent analyses would offer up for what the long-term budget outlook is likely to be.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, we do indeed. I was just looking for the chart that is most applicable. This is one right here. And what we have done here on the bottom line is we have taken, first of all, the baseline projection of the Congressional Budget Office; and as the gentleman noted, they have to assume certain things because those are the rules handed down to them by law.

But we have adjusted their projection for political reality. For example, we have assumed that there would be some continuing expenditures for Iraq and Afghanistan. We have assumed that many of the Bush tax cuts when they reach the expiration date, because most of them have implanted in them a sunset expiration date, that is the way they will pass to begin with, that most, when they reach that sunset date, will, in fact, be renewed and therefore the revenues will not be recouped. When we do that, what we find is that the deficit improves a bit. We get a bounce from the recovery we are experiencing right now. We are not stuck at 521. It improves to about \$389 billion next year and then bottoms out in the range of the mid-\$300 billion level until we get to the far end of our table, at which point it declines again to about \$500 billion. So, essentially, we tread water.

The deficit does not get better. And this is a point everyone should understand: the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget, in making these dire predictions of unending deficits, this assumes a growing economy, a robust economy, growing at 3, 3½ percent a year, even more this year. And notwithstanding the growth, the budget does not grow out of the deficit. It assumes that the economy will be on a pretty even keel for all of this period of time and still we will have these deficits when we know, as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) just said, I do not think this economy can sustain the growth rate we are at right now with the deficits of the magnitude that we are looking at.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure I understand the gentleman and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER). Is the gentleman saying the public debt is going to continue to increase?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, no question about it. This year for the second year in 3 years, we will have a mammoth increase in the debt. Last year alone we had a 1-year increase of \$900 billion in the debt. We will have to increase that debt limit again before we leave here this year, or we will be perilously close to bumping the ceiling.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, just one other thing. I did have a few comments I wanted to share, but I wanted to get the context set here.

Would the gentleman comment about what happens with the massive amount of extra Social Security that we are collecting. As the gentleman knows, Mr. Greenspan famously of late suggested that we might have to cut Social Security benefits along with making these tax cuts permanent.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has been here for some time, and he knows that during the late 1990s and in the early years of this century, we all took solemn vows out here, different forms. We had something called the "lockbox," corny title, serious subject, because essentially what he said was that now that we finally have a surplus for the first time in 30 years, we are going to forswear forever borrowing from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds again. Those trust funds have been building up balances in anticipation of the retirement of the baby boomers ever since 1983. And ever since 1983 until about the year 2000 when we finally hit surplus, we have borrowed to make ends meet from the Social Security trust fund. We have given the trust fund a bond back, but in effect the government has borrowed from these trust funds.

Both Houses, both parties, everybody subscribed to the notion that we should quit that practice. Guess what? The Bush administration's budget every year that we have a projection from OMB or CBO, regardless of who it may be, everybody projects that every year fully the budget will consume the Social Security trust fund surplus and the Medicare trust fund surplus. And they are not small numbers; \$160 billion for Social Security, 20 to \$30 billion per year for Medicare. Every year, every year, when we give the number \$521 billion, we have already taken the surplus in those two trust fund accounts, consolidated it with the other accounts which are in the red, in deficit, and offset or diminished the deficit by the amount of the surpluses this year.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's clarifying that because as disturbing as the previous chart was—

Mr. SPRATT. It is actually worse.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Talking about locking us into \$500 billion up to maybe improve up to \$350 or \$370 billion and then trailing off again to that half trillion dollar level, what, in fact, if I understand what the gentleman is saying, that we are consuming, on top of that, all of the Social Security surplus; so actually it is approaching, over the life of what we can project with reasonable accuracy, a trillion dollars in ultimate debt compounded, this is added, year after year after year.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I did want to commend the gentleman for taking the time to focus in on this critical element of why we are really hung up. The Republican House and the Republican Senate cannot really reconcile what they want to do with the

budget resolution because they are unable to agree amongst themselves about how far to extend these PAYGO rules.

□ 2115

I would like to say that I think anybody in America listening to what you brought forth here this evening needs to understand what the stakes are and why people should be rooting for the other body in extending this important principle across the board, spending as well as taxation.

I am of the opinion that this does not have to be a partisan issue. Like most Members, I was back in my district for 2 weeks, morning, noon and night, listening to people from all walks of life, and with particular attention on April 15, on tax day, and I found that the people understood what the gentleman is talking about at several levels.

Everybody would like dessert, a tax cut, but they understand that this budget is hemorrhaging red ink. They understand the debt tax that is already over \$4,000 for a family of four right now, moving towards \$7,000 in just a few years. But that is the tip of the iceberg, because if interest rates start to spike, and I agree with my colleague from North Carolina, it is miraculously not going to happen before election day, but as sure as we are standing here, they are going to be moving relentlessly upward next year. And, again, our colleague pointed out how much of this debt is in foreign hands, increasingly Chinese, where we lose control over people who are involved with our debt markets.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, just for clarification and an additional point, one beneficial result of our fiscal policies in the 1990s was that we brought down the national debt by \$400 billion between 1998 and 2001. We also, because the government was not borrowing money, but actually putting money into the pool of savings in this country, helped bring down interest rates. As a result, debt service, the interest paid on the national debt, net interest paid on the national debt, dropped from around \$240 billion to \$250 billion a year to about \$160 billion a year. That is a dividend that we had available to do things that people needed and wanted us to do.

Because of the Bush administration policies, that interest payment is going to go up steadily, so that 10 years from now, if we follow the course that CBO plots for the President's budget in its March analysis, debt service, interest paid on the national debt, will be close to \$370 billion. It will more than double from its current level.

What does that do? That is \$370 billion we will not have for education in North Carolina where the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) used to be the superintendent of education. That is \$300 billion we will not have for the environment in Oregon, which is a near and dear thing to the heart of the gentleman.

Furthermore, it builds a sort of cynicism about our government, because people will pay substantial taxes. These are not tax cuts. When you are borrowing the money to finance the tax cut, you are just postponing the event, the inevitable. What will happen is people will be paying more in debt taxes and not seeing anything in return for it, and they become cynical of our government, because so much of what they pay in taxes goes up in smoke, so to speak, because it goes to interest payments.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude with two points, because I agree with what the gentleman is saying, it resonates with me, and I am quite confident that it resonates on the part of most Americans who are dealing with this as a kitchen table issue. They would rather have their debt tax cut, reduce those deficits, than have a couple of dollars in a tax cut that really does not accrue to most average Americans.

I want to just indicate that there are two lines of argument that I find fully specious, one being that somehow this PAYGO concept, pay as you go, for expenditures of the budget or tax expenditures, is somehow biased against cutting the budget. I think if we require the people running around here who want to cut taxes to have to pay for it, it will actually make it more likely that spending will be cut, not less. I must confess that the gentleman's rule, as I read it, is agnostic as to whether taxes should be cut or not. It is just you pay for it.

I happen to want to cut the alternative minimum tax, which is creeping up on American families and is going to hit them like a sledgehammer over the course of the next couple of years. But I think, in fairness, people who care about that ought to be required to offset it in some fashion.

I appreciate the work the gentleman is doing and the opportunity to join the gentleman in this important conversation this evening.

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman for participating.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I have just a question, if I may, on clarification as we get ready to wind down, because I want to make sure I understand what the gentleman said earlier.

Did I understand the gentleman to say that President Bush inherited a projected \$6.6 trillion surplus?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, \$5.6 trillion was the estimate of the surplus by his own budget shop, the Office of Management and Budget, \$5.6 trillion between 2002 and 2011.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Whether that was accurate or not, I am not going to get into that.

Mr. SPRATT. It turns out it was not. Now they have recanted and said it was probably overstated by 55 percent.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Did he not also promise during the campaign when he

came in office to protect Social Security and not invade it?

Mr. SPRATT. Everybody promised. Both parties, both the White House and the Congress, promised that never again, now that we were finally in this position, would we borrow from Social Security and spend the proceeds again. But that is the inevitable consequence. When you reduce that \$5.6 trillion projected surplus by 55 percent, the result is about \$2.6 trillion instead of \$5.6 trillion. That \$2.6 trillion is roughly equal to what is in the Social Security Trust Fund, so if you wanted to keep your promise now that you have adjusted downward the realistic estimate of the surplus, there was no room for additional tax cuts without violating that solemn promise never again to dip into the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for the operation of the government.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for his clarification. I think folks understand that.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few points in closing about the budget.

It is often said, particularly by the President and by others, that we have had an explosion of spending. Indeed, there has been an increase in spending, a big increase in spending, in the last 3 years. But this chart, these four bar graphs show that 90 to 95 percent of the increase in spending over the last 4 years has occurred in defense, homeland security, an account that did not even exist in the budget a couple of years ago, our response to 9/11, the bailout of New York City, the bailout of the airlines, and this is where most of the spending growth remains in the budget.

The President has a budget which he claims will cut the deficit in half in 5 years, but he leaves out one major element, among others: He makes no provision for what it will cost to maintain 125,000 to 135,000 troops in Iraq and another 12,000 in Afghanistan. When the cost of that is added to it, he does not come anywhere close to his claim of cutting the deficit in half over 5 years.

The President has also said the tax cuts were necessary because we have had horrendous job losses, and it is true. Our economy went into recession in March of 2001 and came out in November of 2001. It was a short and shallow recession, but the effect on jobs has persisted. This is the first administration since the Hoover administration not to see a substantial increase in jobs during its tenure. We have had a loss in the private sector of 2.7 million jobs, unrecovered since the start and duration of the recession.

So what has happened, despite the \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion in tax cuts measured over 10 years that we have had in 2001, 2002 and 2003 under the Bush administration, this is the curve here for what the postwar recession typically has been. It has lasted about 27 months. You would have a downturn for 13 or 14 months, an upturn for 13 or 14 months. By the 27th month, the jobs lost would be regained.

Look what happened in this recession.

Notwithstanding three successive substantial tax cuts, we still have a loss of 2.7 million jobs in this country. That is a fact. As was said, once again, you can look it up. You can get it from the Department of Labor.

One other point I would like to make before closing is Social Security and Medicare. One reason that we are so concerned about the deficit, the mounting national debt, is that in 2008 we will have a demographic change in this country like none we have ever seen. The baby-boomers will begin to retire.

There are 77 million of them marching to their retirement right now. They are already born. They are not going anywhere. They will soon be claiming Social Security and then their Medicare, and in 10 to 20 years the number of people on Medicare and Social Security will almost double. The resources required will be substantial for those two programs, which are underfunded.

Most people look at these numbers and say there is no way feasible to deal with this problem, we will just have to restructure the programs. That means we will have to cut benefits, we will have to reconfigure the programs, cut the costs in order to make them affordable.

In truth, if you look at the first bar graph over here, this big fat bar graph of \$14.2 trillion at the top, that is the total amount, the present value of all the tax cuts that the 2001, 2002 and 2003 tax cut laws will necessitate or allow over the next 75 years, 75 years being the timeframe we look to make Social Security solvent.

If you compare the requirements that would be imposed, that are imposed to make Social Security solvent and Medicare solvent, the two come to \$11.9 trillion, the green and the blue here. So the amount of these tax cuts over 75 years is actually more than what is required to make Social Security and Medicare solvent.

We can have this. So those who say this is a set of circumstances we did not foresee and could not control, here is the answer: These are freely chosen policies, and they choose. They choose additional debt, additional deficits, over deficit reduction, and they choose tax cuts over Social Security solvency.

There is a choice here. There is a deliberate choice being made. Those who today say we are victims of circumstance will say the same thing then, but here is the proof right now. If you want to save Social Security, the wherewithal is there to do it, if you do not prefer doing it otherwise for tax purposes.

TAX FREEDOM DAY MOVING UP BECAUSE OF TAX CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr.

PEARCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, as most of the Members did, I just concluded about 16 days in my home district. We had visits about Medicare for the first week and about the economy and the job growth for the second, first of all, addressing concerns and answering questions.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that as I talked to my constituents about the prescription drug Medicare bill, there was a deep understanding that we have done significant work here, first of all, in creating the benefit for our seniors that is desperately needed, but, secondly, causing deep reforms in the Medicare program which should begin to increase the financial stability of that program.

Mr. Speaker, while we were home, there was a dramatic event. During my entire life, I have seen Tax Freedom Day, that day which every American works up until that time to provide their entire income for the Federal Government. That Tax Freedom Day has been as far out as the middle of May, tending toward the first of June.

Mr. Speaker, this year, because of the tax cuts created during the last 3 years, Tax Freedom Day came on April 11. That means every American worked their entire workweek for the Federal Government up to April 11, but those days from April 11 on to December 31, they are working to use the money for their families, for the education of their families, for just the rent, paying for their house, owning a car, or those things that the American dream really entails.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that we are beginning to cause Tax Freedom Day to move back toward January 1, rather than further out toward December 31. We should work less for the government and more for our families.

I will tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that without doubt the family is the key building block of society. Strong families create strong individuals. And strong individuals create strong countries. That is exactly the paradigm that we should be following and have followed in this country throughout our history.

And as we tax less and put more into the pockets of hard-working Americans, I will tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that the strength of the family increases, thereby increasing the strength of our country.

Mr. Speaker, one of the questions that comes up, and it is a fair question, why are we in the economic straits that we are in? What things have contributed to the financial situation that this country faces?

Mr. Speaker, the first event which really shocked our economy, and there have been three deep events that shocked our economy, and it is instructive that we would remember all three

of those, but the first of them was the collapse of the dot-com economy.

Most Americans will remember in the late 1990s that the dot-com industry had really sprung up from very little to something significant, companies that really did not have product. They were not even selling anything. They had no cash flow, no revenues. Those stocks were escalating from no value to \$200 and \$300 value.

Just the capital gains tax off of those sales of stocks began to thrust our growth curves upward. It was primarily due to those capital gains taxes, Mr. Speaker, that we were seeing what economists and what politicians felt like were surplus as far as the eye could see. We remember those days at the end of the Clinton administration where there were the surpluses as far as the eye could see, but they were based on stock values that really had no foundation under them. It was an explosion in value that was driven by emotion, but not fact.

Now, that collapse in the dot-com industry came, as well it should have. Stocks absolutely at some point have to have something to back them up. That collapse came, brought us back down actually to the same level of economy we had been sustaining, about a 3.5 percent of growth. It was the incline up, then it bubbled back over. And after the collapse we had about a 3.5 percent rate of growth.

That shock into our economy was significant, though, shocking us into a mild recession, one that we should have come out from fairly soon. But just as we were coming up out of that recession, 9/11 came without warning. Now, that was a significant shock on the economy, Mr. Speaker. That shock, by the estimates of some, cost \$2 trillion and over 2,000 lives. \$2 trillion needs to be put into the perspective that our total economy is in the \$11 trillion range, so approximately 20 percent of our economic size was taken out of the economy in one day.

When people are concerned about the cost of the war on terror, and it is extremely high, no doubt about it, if we assume that we are up to around \$200 billion at this point, Mr. Speaker, it still is only about one-tenth of what that one day cost on 9/11 was.

That shocked our economy on the heels of the dot-com collapse into a deeper recession and continuing difficulties. But until 9/11, several things had happened. In those eras and those times of surpluses as far as the eye could see, both the Federal Government and the State governments began to reorient their spending, beginning to pay for programs that had long been underfunded.

It is a complaint of our friends across the aisle, and that is fine that they would complain about it, that spending increased tremendously under President Bush. But I will tell you that some of the areas that the spending increased in are the very ones they are criticizing as underfunding.

It is really difficult for me to understand when education spending was at \$27 billion from the Federal programs and has increased under President Bush to over \$66 billion, approaching \$70 billion, that we are described as underfunding education. But if one listens to the rhetoric very carefully, Mr. Speaker, it is underfunding the authorized amount. They do not want to say they are cutting funding, although they occasionally slip over the line and say that, because the truth is we have more than doubled funding for education from Federal sources under President Bush.

And keep in mind it might have been at a better time. It might have been that we might have understood that those surpluses did not exist as far as the eye could see. But I am not sure anyone on either side understood the reality of what was going on. And it is very easy to understand after the fact.

A second area that often we hear our friends on the other side of the aisle discussing is the underfunding of the IDEA, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. Now, it is curious that we hear those descriptions of underfunding in that program, when the truth is that at the inception of IDEA the funding was about \$1 billion and for almost 30 years stayed very constant, much of that time under Democrat control.

The funding stayed constant at about \$1 billion. And finally under President Clinton, it eased up to almost \$2 billion. Now, today you will hear all-out assaults that the President is desperately underfunding IDEA. One would think maybe he had cut it back to \$1 billion. But if we actually look at it, the facts would show that the funding is actually at \$11 billion, almost five times the dramatic increase that came under President Clinton.

Now, one has to begin to ask at some point, are we interested in communicating the situation that the country faces or are we simply throwing out facts?

I would say that this President made commitments to fund serious programs, including education, that at the point right now are causing us to stress as far as our deficits are concerned. So we saw that the Federal Government began to escalate its spending at a time when both parties felt like the surpluses were there as far as the eye could see. It is a fact also that almost every State did the same thing. The economists there were viewing the results the same as the Federal economists.

Just my State and, I think, one other actually preserved budget surpluses through that time because even in the surplus era as of the late 1990s, the Republican Governor of New Mexico said we are going to hold spending very, very tight. And to his credit he did that. Thus, when the dot-com collapse came, when the later 9/11 attack came, shocking our economy into recession and driving down revenues, New Mex-

ico and one other State maintained a surplus, and we saw many of the States begin to have tremendous economic difficulties.

Now, was it their fault that they are in economic difficulties? I do not know. We could place blame. But I think the greater understanding is to know why.

So, again, we experienced increased spending because the perception was that we had surpluses, but we also had two deep shocks into the economy at the very time we were experiencing those surpluses, causing us to go into an economic tail spin.

The third shock, the third of three deep shocks came just as we were about to come out from underneath the effects of 9/11, Mr. Speaker. That is when Global Crossing, WorldCom, Enron, and several other companies had to reveal that they were actually cooking the books, that they were misleading their investors, that they were doing things with accounting procedures that they declared correct, that they declared legal, but which, in fact, may have been legal but certainly were not right. And they did not lead to right conclusions by investors.

At that point of deception, many, many investors began to pull their money out of the stock market and put it into savings accounts and banks. That began to remove needed capital from our companies where economic expansion was no longer available.

So three deep shocks into the economy: the dot-com collapse of the late 1990–2000 time period; 9/11/2001, a second deep shock; the third deep shock was the corporate scandals led by Global Crossing, Enron, and WorldCom. All those three things combined to give us a significant change in our economic climate.

Now, at that point in our economic climate, when we had increased spending believing that surpluses were there as far as the eye could see, we had increased spending and suddenly three shocks into the economy caused the revenues to drop. Now we are faced with some management questions.

It is easy at this point, Mr. Speaker, to sit and say what should be and should not be. But I will tell my colleagues when we get to that discussion there really are only three solutions that I see: one is to cut spending, the second is to increase taxes, and the third is to grow the economy. If we grow the economic size, and it is about \$11 trillion now, if we grow the economic size from about \$11 trillion or 13 or 14 trillion, it is easy for anyone to understand that at the same rates of taxes that we are going to have more revenues.

So we can, again, to solve the problem of deficits from both internal and external causes, caused by increased spending and recession that has been thrown into us from three violent shocks to the economy, given those situations, again, the three solutions are to increase taxes to bring in more revenue, to cut spending, or to grow the

size of the economy. It is really simple. There are not many other choices than that.

Now, the problem is if you begin to increase taxes at a time of economic stress, you come into an economic principle and economic reality that when government spending begins to increase to a certain percent of the economy, and generally the range is in the 20 to 24 percent range, Mr. Speaker, at that point you begin to take so much of the investment capital out of the economy that recovery is simply not available.

The Germans find themselves in that situation right now. When I came back from Iraq, we stopped in Stuttgart and met with several key business leaders at a dinner at night. Around the table uniformly, and the head of DaimlerChrysler is at that location, it was in that meeting they said please get your economy going because if your economy is going, if the United States economy is going, maybe it will raise the level of the entire economic output in the entire world because we are one-third of the world's economy. And if we can get our economy going in the U.S., just maybe they can get their economy going in Germany.

Now, the difficulty they face in Germany is about 44 percent of their current gross domestic product is government spending. They cannot get out of a recession. They cannot create jobs. They cannot do it because they refuse to cut spending, and they refuse to cut taxes. Taxes would begin to lower that amount of government spending down as a percentage. But keep in mind they are desperately high at 44 percent.

We were approaching the 24 percent level, which really does begin to dampen down an economy and put the economic brakes on. So we had some choices to make in this Congress and the preceding Congress of just how to handle this. How do you go about creating economic growth? How could you create economic growth when you have had three deep shocks that have taken tremendous assets, both physical assets and the lives of our countrymen?

My colleagues recall after 9/11 people just began to stay home. They did not consume, and they did not spend. It was a sadness, there was a deep sorrow in our Nation that really affected us emotionally as well as spiritually and emotionally.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have those situations that existed in our economy. I will tell my colleagues that the Democrat Governor of New Mexico said it best last year. He said that my party should get over the fact that tax cuts create jobs.

That is what we wanted to do in this body. Keep in mind we have three choices: we can cut spending, we can increase taxes, or we can grow the size of the economy so that our tax rates bring more revenues.

We elected, Mr. Speaker, in this House, and I am proud to have been a part of that vote, to begin to try to

grow the economy. And we did that by decreasing the amount of government spending, that is, by increasing the take-home pay of our people in our economy. We began to give tax cuts.

Now, those tax cuts began to show immediate promise. The biggest tax cut took place last year. We had estimates in the House, estimates that said we hoped we would get 3.5 percent rate of growth from the tax cuts that we gave. But we would have been satisfied for any rate of growth. We were stunned, Mr. Speaker, when we saw the economic growth in the third quarter of last year jump to 8.2 percent. No one had even anticipated that level of growth in our economy. In the fourth quarter it settled down to a more stable sustainable 4 percent and continues in that 4 to 5 percent range today with Alan Greenspan saying that the economic indicators are good. Independent watchdog groups have looked at our economy and said it looks positive for the next 2 years.

□ 2145

One of the problems, though, in the recovery was that jobs had not been created. I heard a lot of my colleagues on both sides of the House express concerns, and I understood the concerns, but, Mr. Speaker, as a business owner, I also understood the other side because as a business owner, the last thing I wanted to do is hire permanent employees. If I am in a period of growth, then, first of all, I want to work overtime because I do not want to hire employees and then have to lay them off if we are just in a little bubble upward.

So the first thing we will do to see if we are going to get through this pick-up in activity is we begin to work overtime just an hour here or an hour there. The next thing we begin to do, Mr. Speaker, is work weekends. When those two things do not combine to fill the needs for employees, Mr. Speaker, at that point we would always bring in temporary employees, and I say "we" because my wife and I were co-owners in the company. She managed one piece, I managed the other piece, and we have always made our decisions together. But always on hiring we wanted to do the same thing, so we would progress through this sequence over time, working Saturdays and Sundays, temporaries, and then we would hire part-timers. Usually we would go to retirees who did not need full-time jobs, but always would like to have 3 or 4 hours a week or 3 or 4 hours a day.

So we would do these four steps before we hired full-time employees. And so, Mr. Speaker, it was not so concerning to me at that point that we had not seen the job figure growth after two successive quarters of significant growth in our economy. As we went into the early months of this year, again the job growth had been small, at about 300,000 for about a 2- to 3-month period, but in March alone, Mr. Speaker, we had stunning news

that this economy that had shown all the signs of economic recovery in fact produced 308,000 new jobs in 1 month. That 308,000 new jobs, Mr. Speaker, combined to make almost a million since August of last year.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, we feel the signs of recovery. We are beginning to show those signs of job growth which is beginning to show growth signs, and we are beginning to hear it frequently on the floor of the House from our friends. I would expect to see the 300,000 jobs in 1 month. They will begin to rejoice with us because no one would like to see a Nation in suffering. We would like to see a Nation that has found the key to recovery, and these keys are not so simple as going out and causing recovery and passing a law. We have to rekindle the confidence of the consumer. We have to rekindle the confidence of the investor, the confidence in companies that were shaken by corporate wrongdoing, the confidence of purchasers that were shaken by the tragic events of 9/11. So this restarting of the economy should be a rejoicing for each one of us, and I hope that it is that, because, in my view, the last thing we want to do is begin to change courses.

I, along with my friends on the other side of the aisle, am very concerned about the deficit, but also I know that we have done some very expensive things last year that could not be put off. The Medicare prescription drug bill was an expensive bill that 78 percent of Americans said needed to occur because people were choosing between food and medicine. Yet it was very expensive. We must have the will to pay for it, and we must have the economic discipline to pay for it.

The war on terror is extremely expensive and is taking much, much out of our economy, and that needed to be done, and the President is pursuing that with bold determination to win that war on terror and preserve the liberty that is the world's, because terror and liberty cannot live in the world together. 9/11 changed forever the way we look at this world.

Mr. Speaker, another important expenditure that we have undertaken that have helped create the deficits, and even though we do not like them, we begin to understand that we are having to do things that could not be put off, homeland security could not be put off. We must begin to seal our borders so that the American people would feel safe. We must begin to do those things which will keep terror outside our borders. So we fight the war on terror to kill and disable terrorists in their own areas, but we begin to build our own borders that would protect the lives of our children and give them access to the hope and opportunity that peaceful neighborhoods give to each one of us and that we have raised our families with.

These are the things that we have been spending money on in the last year and 2 years that are going to fund

a deficit. And do we like the deficit? No, we do not. But we must be patient. This year the discussion is should we allow the tax cuts to expire because they are temporary, and they expire towards the end of this year. So the discussion is, and we should be on the floor of this House having that discussion, and we have will it, should we allow the tax cuts to expire?

I will tell you that once we have charted a course, the worst single thing is to begin to withdraw and to find another course. In history we can determine that several courses usually will solve a problem, but we have elected to a course here; we have chosen the course of trying to grow the economy. We have given the tax cuts that have stimulated the growth and jobs, and the last thing we need to do is to retreat out and not pursue that one single objective of growing the economy, reestablishing our economic stability, creating jobs so that every American in this country is able to find a career that they look for, is able to have employment security with the outcome of raising and maintaining good families.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will continue this discussion this year. I myself believe that we must stay with the tax cuts that we have put into place; that to do otherwise would again begin to thrust up the percent of government spending as a percent of our gross domestic product and run the risk of pouring water on the flames, the low flames of our economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined in the House tonight by my colleague from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ). We came in as freshmen. He, like I, has been a businessman. He, like I, has made a payroll; and like I, he married above his head, and his wife now runs their business, as mine does. So I, Mr. Speaker, would yield to the gentleman from Colorado to discuss this economic recovery from his eye, and is from the eyes of a man with a dairy background and with a banking background. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I especially thank him for acknowledging the quality of our wives. We are blessed indeed, are we not? And I thank the gentleman for bringing this Special Order to the floor tonight.

It strikes me that there are a lot of people out there that are trying to convince people that maybe conditions are different than they really exist. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) just acknowledged that I have been a businessman before myself. I have met payroll. I have created jobs. Most recently I was CEO and president and chairman of a bank. I am kind of prone to analyzing things and getting a basis of comparison, the "compare to test" I call it. Compared to what?

Folks are talking about how bad things are. Well, I have done a little reading. I think my colleagues in this Chamber, all of us, do quite a lot of

reading, and I have found a few things that I think are fairly interesting. Specifically, there has been a lot of talk lately about how great everybody else is, and especially our friends over in Europe, how good they are doing. Well, I was in Europe. In fact, I was in France last May, not quite a year ago, representing this great body as a representative of the United States Congress at a conference on terrorism and the growth of anti-Semitism in Europe. And I witnessed for myself how "good" they are doing. They were not doing all that great, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, according to an article in the *National Review* just this very month, our economy has grown about one-third faster than Europe's or Japan's, Mr. Speaker, even though, of course, as my colleague from New Mexico just cited, it was us that experienced the ravages of 9/11, an event, Mr. Speaker, that I submit to you, I submit to this body, would have crippled, perhaps destroyed, the economies and the governments of nearly every other nation on this Earth. But yet we are growing faster.

Now, some of us, myself included, are certainly old enough to remember an index that was created some time ago called the misery index. It was not created by me. It was not created by you, Mr. Speaker. I think we remember where it came from. It was invented by our friends in the other party in an attempt to bludgeon a former President, Gerald Ford, for the condition of the economy.

Let us go back and look. Let us use that as a comparison. When Gerald Ford was running for reelection in 1976, this misery index, which was a simple combination of the inflation rate and the unemployment rate, add the two together as an indicator of the pulse, if you will, of the economy. Well, that misery index in 1976 when President Ford ran for reelection and was unsuccessful was 11 percent. In 1980, that misery index rose to 17 percent under then President Carter, and the country decided to make a change. When President Clinton ran for his reelection in 1996, which our colleagues on the other side continually cite as the best of times, the misery index, again, inflation plus unemployment, stood at 8 percent. Now, Mr. Speaker, that same index today stands at 7.8 percent, the lowest, obviously, of that entire period. And yet our colleagues on the other side of the aisle night after night, day after day are trying to convince the American people that they administration under this party's leadership is experiencing "the worst economic performance since Herbert Hoover."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot find evidence to support that claim. And just because you say it is so does not make it so. The facts do not bear it out.

A few other facts, Mr. Speaker, if I might. Again, I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, I have created jobs. I have met payroll, and I am proud of that. So

I am concerned like many about those seeking employment in this country but not able to find it. We are addressing that situation. Jobs are coming back. We all know that they are the lagging indicator. That does not make us feel any better, but it is one of those economic realities.

Now, if we go back to 1979, 1980, that recession, unemployment hit 7.9 percent. The mini-recession in 1982, it peaked at 10.8 percent. Then in 1990, one I remember very well, it hit 7.8 percent before beginning to fall.

Now, all of this seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to pale by comparison to the 6.3 percent that we hit even following 9/11, even with the effects of a recession and then the tremendous impact of a 9/11. Why? Because with this President's leadership, the 107th Congress enacted tax cuts in 2001, and we have followed now with tax cuts again in 2003.

Now, to reference again what is going on in the European Continent, which many seem to want to cite as some sort of utopia, some sort of model, well, over in Europe right now the European Union is averaging unemployment of about 8 percent, Mr. Speaker, about 8 percent.

□ 2200

We are at 5.7 today and falling, and we are the ones, again, who experienced the ravages of 9/11. If we were doing as well, and I use that in quotes, as our friends in the European continent, we would have 3 million more jobless Americans, Mr. Speaker. That is my comparison. That is one of my comparisons.

Additionally, let us look at just some statistics. We are under assault nightly for the terrible, again, I use that in quotes, tax cuts that we imposed last year and the conditions that it has created, and there is at least one person running around this country campaigning to be our next President to change the course, that wants to rescind those tax cuts. Well, let us make a little comparison.

Beginning in May of 2003, which is shortly before this body approved those tax cuts and before the President even had the pleasure of signing those tax cuts, until February of this year, to give a baseline of when we got current numbers, the Dow has increased almost 20 percent, the NASDAQ almost 30 percent. Not everybody has stocks, but it is a pretty good bellwether of what is going on economically in this country and where we are headed, the faith and confidence in the market; and I know full well and I would guess my colleagues, too, Mr. Speaker, have had any number of constituents come up to them and talk about that 401(k) that is now a 1(k). Remember that joke, Mr. Speaker?

Well, the markets have come back, and that is real value in the pockets and the wallets and in the bank for the people all over the country that have got an IRA, 401(k), any kind of pension plan, a little investment in a mutual fund.

It is estimated that some 3 trillion, with a T, Mr. Speaker, \$3 trillion have returned to the market, returned to people's net asset value. That is a good thing. Real gross domestic product, same period of time, just inside of 9 months, increased 6.1 percent. Productivity, 6.4 percent while we are increasing job growth, albeit a little bit slow, but increasing job growth, adding employment figures, productivity up 6.4 percent, just inside of 9 months.

Housing starts, strongest in 20 years, Mr. Speaker, increase of 9 percent just inside that 9-month period of time, all while unemployment on a percentage basis fell 8.2 percent. Mortgage rates lowest in 20 years, prime interest rates lowest in 45 years, and inflation the lowest in 4 decades.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers do not bear out their claim that this is the worst economic performance since Herbert Hoover. We should be celebrating, Mr. Speaker, not only the actions of this body, the other body in Congress and the White House, but especially celebrating the will, the fortitude, the entrepreneurship of the American worker and the American businessman. That is who we ought to be celebrating. They are doing the heavy lifting, and they are performing. The system is working. It is not time, Mr. Speaker, to change course nor captains of the ship.

It has been cited that manufacturing has taken a tough hit. Indeed they have, indeed they have; and no one, no one should know better what the true nature of the reason for the difficulties, the struggles that manufacturing has gone through, nobody should know better than manufacturing.

I happened to come across a little communication from the National Association of Manufacturers, an organization that represents, Mr. Speaker, manufacturers all over this land, largest organization of its kind, so far as I know. I would assume that they are a legitimate mouthpiece for their members.

I do not like to read at this hour or during these Special Orders very often, but I do not want to misstate anything either, Mr. Speaker. So I am just going to quote what the National Association of Manufacturers tells us.

Let us look at the real sources of manufacturing job loss. While many were lost to productivity gains in technology, there were many other major factors as well, such as 900,000 jobs lost when U.S. exports tanked owing to the overvalued dollar and slow growth abroad. That is the problem in other countries. Their economies were in the tank, the value of our dollar went up, 900,000 jobs because of foreign problems.

75,000 jobs lost in the chemical sector alone, due largely to skyrocketing natural gas prices. Mr. Speaker, maybe we can talk about that at another point in time, too.

60,000 jobs lost due to asbestos litigation that drove companies right into

bankruptcy. We have a solution to that. We have a solution that will save companies, save jobs. Members on the other side of the aisle say no, no, no, let us give it to the trial lawyers and bankrupt companies. I do not know how you can have it both ways, Mr. Speaker, create jobs and put companies out of business at the same time and thousands more jobs lost because of the high cost of doing business in America.

Here is what they say: nonproduction costs, nonproduction costs such as taxes, excessive legal and regulatory burdens, and the rising cost of natural gas and health care add 22 percent to the cost of making a product in America relative to our major trading partners. Mr. Speaker, I am not making that up. This is from the National Association of Manufacturers. That is why we struggle in this country to be competitive in a global market, even a domestic market, because taxes, excessive legal and regulatory burdens, and the rising costs of energy and health care are stifling American business, thus, American workers.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical subject. I thank the gentleman for bringing it to the attention of this body and I see he has something on his mind that he would like to say. I thank him for the time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) for his thoughts on this subject and for the calm approach that he has to dissecting a very difficult problem.

Always when you face difficulties it is easy to discuss the difficulties, but understanding those elements that must be changed in the very measured way that they must be changed is the difficult part of this business.

He began to discuss why would American jobs be leaving our country. I think that he is on a very, very timely subject in discussing the cost of frivolous lawsuits, lawsuits that would drive companies out of this country.

About a year ago, Mr. Speaker, right at this time of year, I went to Ground Zero in New York. We went across the street to American Express; and the head of American Express told us, as congressional leaders, that if you do not reform lawsuit litigation problems in this Nation that you will not have a major company left in America in 20 years. I see those pressures that litigation costs us.

Currently, the cost of lawsuits on the U.S. is equivalent to a 5 percent tax on wages. Litigation cost \$233 billion in 2002. This is \$807 per U.S. citizen. Increased litigation costs have burdened American families and businesses with higher insurance premiums and contributed to higher medical costs and, in some places, removing medical care completely as doctors go into retirement or refuse to practice under the conditions that face them.

Individuals suffered directly by having less disposable income than they would otherwise have due to increased

prices for products but also higher insurance premiums. Individuals suffered directly when businesses raised their prices on goods and services to pay for the litigation costs.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce 2 years ago was advertising in my district that the cost for every consumer who bought a new car for the litigation costs throughout the production of that car was over \$500 per vehicle that every single American consumer paid.

Individual wages bear the brunt in the form of lower wages in jobs and fewer jobs when we are exposed to continued litigation, and that is not litigation to respond to problems. These are frivolous lawsuits that come up simply because the legal community feels like they can get redress outside the courts, that they can get settlements outside the court without jury trial.

Frivolous lawsuits discourage businesses and individuals from taking risk, which means that fewer new products are brought to production and new technologies are either delayed or foregone completely. Consequently, good, high-paying jobs are not created because of the fear of lawsuits. Companies are left going bankrupt instead of being able to pay the high cost of litigation.

Currently, this House has passed four kinds of tort reform, four kinds of litigation reform that currently have stalled out in this city, unable to move further because of the influence of the personal injury lawyers in this community. Out of this House, Mr. Speaker, we have passed class action tort reform, asbestos tort reform, medical liability reform and then also, just recently, that cheeseburger bill because the personal injury lawyers are trying to tap into the pockets of every single restaurant owner in America saying they are the cause that people are sick or overweight.

Mr. Speaker, just the asbestos litigation reform is needed to begin to deal with the tremendous numbers of cases that face us. An estimated 300,000 claims are pending, 730,000 individuals have already brought claims and 60 to 100,000 new claims are filed every year.

Asbestos victims face uncertainty, delay, and risk in the current tort system. Today, a person's compensation is more likely to be determined by where and when the claim is filed and who is the lawyer or judge rather than by the severity of his illness. Many victims even die before receiving anything.

To name a few examples, after having his claim consolidated with 1,000 other plaintiffs in a Louisiana trial, a former Avondale shipyard employee died of mesothelioma before his trial even began. An Ohio welder died during trial. A flooring contractor died during his trial in California. While some courts prioritize cases where plaintiffs suffer from mesothelioma, other times plaintiffs can die before or during the trial. Exponential growth in claims involving plaintiffs who are not sick is clogging the system. Those people who

are simply making claims with no physical symptoms are clogging the system so that those who are legitimately sick are unable to move forward with their claims. Mr. Speaker, this is an economic distress to companies that maybe never even manufactured asbestos. It is an affront to our entire system.

In 2001, an asbestos verdict awarded six unimpaired Mississippi plaintiffs \$25 million each. None of the plaintiffs claimed prior medical expenses or absences from work due to any related illness; but they were awarded a combined total of \$150 million, Mr. Speaker, and they had never claimed any absences from work due to related illnesses. These unimpaired awards have bankrupted 67 companies and wrung \$54 billion from companies. Some experts estimate that under the current broken system the past and future trials of asbestos liability will ultimately reach as much as \$200 billion or more.

Mr. Speaker, to put these numbers in perspective, the savings and loan sector crisis in the 1980s and 1990s cost approximately \$153 billion. The collapse of Enron and WorldCom resulted in losses of as much as \$42 billion in gross domestic product and as much as \$50 billion in insurance industry losses and as much as \$50 billion in insurance losses stemming from the September 11 terrorist attacks.

□ 2215

Most unfortunately, the asbestos litigation system imposes billions of dollars of costs, while claimants receive very little of what is paid. Transaction costs have accounted for well over half of the spending. Plaintiff attorney fees alone can be 40 percent of any settlement, with expenses often reducing the settlement to less than 50 percent.

It is not just the American companies that are left with the cost, it is the American worker. Companies bankrupted by these 75 percent of unwarranted asbestos claims have slashed 60,000 jobs and failed to create 423,000 new jobs. Each displaced worker has lost up to \$50,000 in wages and an average of 25 percent of the value of their 401(k) accounts. Even the AFL-CIO testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, noting that the uncertainty for workers and their families is growing as they lose health insurance and see their companies file for bankruptcy protection.

So while our friends on the other side of the aisle continue to talk about the jobs that move overseas and the failure of this economy to create jobs, they are overlooking one of the most important cures, Mr. Speaker, that can be found to be effective: that of litigation reform.

Mr. Speaker, I see that the gentleman from Colorado has additional comments, and I yield back to him.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank him for his timely comments as well.

We talk about large numbers in this body. We are dealing with a \$2.4 trillion

budget this year. And running the United States of America's business is certainly an expensive business. But while I was home over the last couple of weeks, I talked to a whole lot of constituents. I know the gentleman has a great deal of familiarity with the energy business, and, not surprisingly, energy came up over and over again.

I think in the context that we have been discussing these last about 45 minutes now of embedded costs, costs that stifle competitiveness, job creation, economic growth, and all the things we are all talking about, now we have this rapidly escalating cost of energy.

A friend of mine, a young mother, she has three children. I think the oldest is about eight. So this mother of these three little children, she is absolutely beside herself. She does not work outside the home. She is home doing what moms ought to do, taking care of her three little kids and doing a good job of it. Her husband works and is bringing home a decent income, but one can imagine that things are pretty tight around her house.

She is now faced with rapidly escalating costs of gasoline and in their utility bill at home. So I went looking for numbers. She pulled up to the pump just behind me and she said, oops. Regular unleaded that day was about \$1.85, and the next two grades were over \$2. I think it was \$2.05 and \$2.13, if I remember correctly. The AAA estimates that in the average two-car household, they use about 1,200 gallons of gasoline a year. I know the gentleman is from New Mexico. I am from Colorado. Out our way we drive even more miles, I think, than the average, so that 1,200 gallons is probably a conservative number for the average household.

Now, imagine just a 50-cent-per-gallon increase. And we have had all of that. Maybe it is closer to 60 or 70 cents now in just recent months. But at 50 cents, 1,200 gallons a year, that is obviously a \$600-a-year additional burden on that family. That \$600 has to come from somewhere, so I asked her, where does it come from, Teresa? Teresa says, I just have to do without something. We do not take the kids to the zoo, or we do not take the kids to McDonald's for a Happy Meal. We are starting to make those tough choices.

We have to stop and ask ourselves, I think, what are we doing to American people? In addition to that extra \$50 a month to pay her fuel bill, Teresa tells me that her energy prices, the utility bill at home, has gone up about \$30 a month, too. Now, sooner or later it gets to be real money.

That evening I spoke to a group of realtors. They have been enjoying pretty good times, because, thankfully, interest rates have been very low, and, to a very real degree, the housing market has kind of kept us going as we get jobs coming back on the market. But they are concerned, and they are concerned for exactly this reason: I asked them, I said, how many of your clients have

wanted to put a contract on a house, and they pushed the numbers, and, having been a banker before, I understand how this works, and they find out they just barely or maybe not quite qualify for that new home they would like to buy? It is often \$50 or \$100 a month one way or the other. When energy costs alone go up that much, you just have a whole pile more folks who cannot afford going that next step up the ladder. That does not make sense.

We have passed an energy bill out of this body three times since 2001. It is time that the entire Congress, with the cooperation of the other body, do what America desperately needs and pass an energy bill, send it down Pennsylvania Avenue and let the President sign it.

There is no silver bullet solution. But as the gentleman knows, we need to address some common-sense regulation relief, common-sense permitting, and create some jobs at home. And that is the other thing that is so maddening, as we talk day after day after day, and we hear rhetoric in the media and from candidates running for all kinds of offices about jobs. Pass an energy bill.

The Department of Commerce estimates that for every \$1 billion we send offshore, those foreign sources which we are now two-thirds dependent on for our total energy supply, for every \$1 billion we send them, we are sending them 12,389 jobs. With what we are sending in total today, the billions and billions, that is 1.7 million American jobs that are somewhere else on this planet, and in the meantime we are paying more. Less jobs; more for our energy.

Mr. Speaker, you do not have to be the proverbial rocket scientist to figure out that that will not work forever and ever and ever. So rhetoric is not going to get it done. Sooner or later we have to have some decent policy. The American people are feeling the pinch right now, and they need to hear the truth.

My colleague talked about litigation reform. We talked about how we have to have some regulation relief in this country. We talked about the effects of the tax cuts. We need a good energy policy to go with it.

Mr. Speaker, I see the gentleman has that look in his eye that says he has something to close with, so I yield back to him and thank him for his kindness this evening in letting me participate.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ), and he is exactly right. We have passed the energy bill out of this Congress, and it is stalled out, unable to move further. The estimates are that energy bill would create 800,000 jobs nationwide.

Now, the most important thing it would do is begin to limit our dependence on foreign oil. And when people ask, what is suddenly causing the price of oil to escalate, it is very simple. The OPEC countries decided they are going

to try to squeeze off the supply, understanding our demand is fairly constant. If they squeeze off the world supply of oil, the price goes up.

Now, those are independent countries. They operate on their own. Our President is asking them, it is an arbitrary decision on their part, if they will not consider going ahead and increasing the supply where the price will moderate. But the fact remains that we do get about 60 percent of our energy from overseas, and there are people in this country, the extremists, who would say we should not produce any energy in this country. They would like to move all drilling to other countries. They do not want to drill offshore, they do not want us to drill in the Rocky Mountains, they do not want those jobs in America, and they do not want an America independent of foreign energy production.

Mr. Speaker, this economy that America has is built on one thing and one thing only: It is built on affordable energy. And right now the price of natural gas in this country is between \$5 and \$6, last year spiking up to \$10. In Russia and in Africa right now the price is between 50 cents and 70 cents. We cannot sustain our economy at the levels it is and the levels that it has traditionally been, paying five times for our energy.

There are those extremists who say that we cannot and should not drill in areas that have been drilled before on our public lands. Mr. Speaker, we are going to decide in this country if we want a vibrant economy or if we are going to send all those jobs overseas, because that is what will happen. Infrastructure will eventually relocate to the area where energy costs are one-tenth of what they are today. In the meantime, we are going to be faced with paying more at the pump because we have internal policies which refuse to allow drilling to occur in places in this country where there are known and proven reserves.

Mr. Speaker, I would also make comment that it is time that we have these discussions. I think that in this Nation we can reach the balance between preserving the environment and providing affordable energy, and it is time that we begin to look at those policies which will allow us to do that. We cannot continue shipping jobs overseas because of the cost of litigation, because of the cost of energy, because of our unwillingness to deal with the regulatory climate that simply frightens people out of investing in new jobs in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we ourselves, as Americans, are going to determine at what level our economy operates, and it is each one of those small increments that will determine exactly what we do.

In concluding the discussion tonight, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the gentleman from Colorado for participating with me, I would remind the House that our economy has been suffering

from three deep shocks. It is suffering from the deep shock of the dot-com collapse, of the 9/11 strike, and finally the corporate scandals, which are now being tried in our courts.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans and the President have charted bold initiatives that are pulling us out of the economic recessions that began in the late 1990s and early 2000. Those recoveries must be sustained. That tremendous job growth in March is an indicator of what lies ahead, 308,000 new jobs in 1 month.

Mr. Speaker, we have 138 million jobs in this Nation, but every single person who needs a job and a career should be able to find it. And with the policies that this administration and this Congress have passed, we are on the road to recovery and providing careers for every person that looks for them.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNS). The Chair must remind Members to avoid improper references to the Senate.

IRAQ AND RECENT REVELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for half the time remaining before midnight.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be joined here this evening by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and another of my colleagues, the gentleman from the State of Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) as we talk about what is happening in Iraq, the needs of our troops, and what the American people need to know. Much of the information is just now becoming clear to us as a result of Mr. Woodward's book, which became available to the general public today.

□ 2230

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my comments by making reference to a comment the President made in his most recent press conference when he made reference to what he would say to the troops. In that statement he said, "We will provide them what they need." That sounds like a rather direct and simple statement, but the truth is we have not provided our troops in Iraq with what they need, not in terms of equipment certainly, equipment that has the potential to save lives and to avoid serious injuries.

Mr. Speaker, the war began in March 2003. Soon after that war began, I received a letter from a young soldier from my district who is a West Point graduate and a gung-ho Army guy, and he started his letter by saying, Congressman, I am so proud of the Army. I am so proud of what we are trying to do here to help these people. But later in his letter he said to me, my men are

wondering why they have not been provided with these life-saving interceptor vests, which became available, I believe, in 1998. They cost \$1,200 to \$1,500 apiece. They are made with Kevlar with pockets in the front and back where ceramic plates can be inserted which will stop an AK-47 bullet. They are life-saving equipment, and yet we send our soldiers into battle in Iraq, and thousands and thousands were without this equipment.

Now, the war began in March. I received this letter from this young soldier in the early summer. I wrote the Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld a letter sharing what I had been told by this young West Point soldier, and asked him when our troops would be provided with this life-saving equipment. He wrote me back. I got a letter in September from the Secretary telling me that he expected that our soldiers would be fully equipped with this life-saving equipment in November. Within a day of getting the letter from Secretary Rumsfeld, I received a letter from the chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff General Myers, and in his letter General Myers indicated it would be December, not November as Secretary Rumsfeld had said, but it would be December before all of our soldiers were equipped with the interceptor vests.

Then before we left this city for our Christmas vacation, our holiday vacation, the Pentagon held a briefing, and in that briefing we were told that it would be January before our soldiers were equipped with these life-saving vests. I remind my colleagues that the war began in March, and we are being told that it will be January before the soldiers are provided with life-saving vests. Lo and behold, after I came back to this city after the holidays, and I was continuously troubled that this problem had not been solved, so I wrote Secretary Rumsfeld another letter reminding him that the self-imposed deadline had passed.

Finally, finally, in March of this year, I received a letter informing me that finally all of our soldiers had been equipped with this life-saving vest, 1 full year after the war began.

Now we have a similar problem because many of our soldiers are being killed and wounded in Iraq because they are driving around in Humvees that are not up-armored Humvees. In other words, they do not have the proper armor that will protect them if the soldiers are attacked while on patrol. Soldiers are driving in Iraq with unarmored Humvees. I am concerned about this, and I say to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) the only company that has a sole contract with the Pentagon to provide these up-armored Humvees and the kits to armor those already deployed is an Ohio company, O'Gara-Hess.

O'Gara-Hess officials came to my office, and they told me under their current contract with the Department of

Defense, they are being asked to produce 220 of these up-armored Humvees each month. However, they are capable of producing up to 500 a month. The Pentagon says there are about 4,000 of these Humvees in Iraq that need to be so armored to protect our soldiers, and it will probably be sometime in 2005 before it is all done. The question that I would ask: If the President was standing where you are standing, I would say to the President, Mr. President, this is a life-saving matter. Why are you not directing your Pentagon to provide our soldiers with this protection as quickly as possible?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the answer would be, as has been enunciated in a series called The Spoils of War on Marketplace. Members may be familiar with the program Marketplace. It is on the radio and follows the National Public Radio news, All Things Considered, the afternoon edition of it. There is a business broadcast called Marketplace which reviews the market decisions, the business activities of the country, and in their series entitled The Spoils of War, Members will find that the money which otherwise might have been spent, according to the contract that your company represents, to provide armor for the Humvees is now going out at the rate of tens of millions of dollars a week, perhaps a month, in graft and corruption through the Bank of Iraq, with nothing in the way of any kind of accountability under the Provisional Authority, Mr. Bremer's Provisional Authority.

This is being done today. They are done with DGs, or director generals, of the various Iraqi ministries. They are the equivalent of under secretaries. They go into the bank and walk out with cardboard boxes full of cash. Corruption is in the hands of clerks who simply rubber-stamp the action, and the American companies that are over there taking the money are paying bribes, are involved in mass corruption, and this is where the money is going. This is what the Provisional Authority is involved in. This is what is happening.

We cannot respond to you and your constituents in Ohio and those people in Ohio who are capable of providing armor for our troops because we have to make sure that those who say they were on our side, those who say they were the sources of Iraqi information and intelligence and upon whom we could rely are the very ones who are involved up to their eyeballs in corruption and graft in Iraq and Baghdad itself to the detriment of our own troops' capacity to be able to defend themselves.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I wish there could be the kind of sunlight that our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) has

said. Sadly, it is impacting your constituents and your company, but let me say what it really means to the American people.

He is asking the real question who is in control? Who is providing the fire-wall to ensure that the young men and women who have committed themselves to putting themselves on the front lines, for whatever the cause. We know there are young men and women on the front lines. Might I say there are also civilians who are there, and some of them are hostages. Today one of my companies announced that three of their employees were found dead. We know there are hostages still held. We want to offer our prayers for those families, and the military families as well; but who is in charge?

Before we went off on break, I went to Walter Reed Hospital and saw the results of unreinforced Humvees and saw the results of the misuse of dollars in as much as rather than having the resources to ensure that land mines or the explosive devices are not utilized against our troops because maybe they are shorthanded, we are in the crux of confusion with not enough resources to be able to restore Humvees. Soldiers that I visited showed me limbs that were lost. When I was in Iraq, they showed me that they were reinforcing them with sandbags. One soldier said that he did not get hurt as badly as he might have because they had used sandbags.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I received a call a few days ago from a soldier returning after 14 months in Iraq. He said, "Congressman, your Ford Explorer that you drive around is better armored than the Humvee that I drove around Iraq." The fact is so many of the wounds and the deaths are occurring because of these devices that are planted in the roadways, and our soldiers are driving over them, and they are exploding, and there is nothing in that vehicle to protect them.

These up-armored Humvees have steel plating in the bottom and on the sides. They can even reinforce the windshield so that the windshield itself is impenetrable. It can be done. The President said to our soldiers, we will provide you what you need, but the President is not providing our soldiers what they need.

Regardless of what people feel about this war, Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative, the one thing we should be able to agree upon is if we are going to send our soldiers into harm's way, we provide them with every bit of equipment that they may need to be safe. Why we are not doing it, and why we are not doing it as rapidly as possible, I do not know.

MS-NBC had a TV program about this last week. They identified the problem, and they indicated steps were being taken to correct it as quickly as possible. I can tell Members tonight, steps are not being taken to correct this problem as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, if I were the President, I would get on the phone to Secretary

Rumsfeld, and I would say, fix this problem as quickly as it can be fixed, regardless of what it takes, 7 days a week of work, 3 shifts a day, whatever it takes. Get our troops the equipment they need to be protected, and do it as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. In that context, I can tell Members as someone who was part of the first group to go into Iraq right after the initial attack on Baghdad, going from the Baghdad airport to Saddam Hussein's palace where Mr. Bremer was being installed and displacing General Garner, and we were there the day after he had taken control there, we said to him at that time, you can have all of the equipment in the world, but as I said to him, Mr. Ambassador, driving from the Baghdad airport to Baghdad itself and to this palace that we now occupy, you are going to have to have 10,000 soldiers who guard that highway. I do not care what kind of equipment and armor you have, you do not arm a Humvee and then send somebody out to play lottery with their lives. No matter what the equipment is, when you only have a strip of tar coming across the desert, no lights, no protection, nothing, I said it is going to take 10,000 soldiers.

The plain fact of the matter is when General Shinseki, who had responsibility for the well-being of his soldiers, indicated as chief of the Army that it would take hundreds of thousands of soldiers, hundreds of thousands of Army and Marine personnel and support in order to initiate and sustain such an attack and deal with the aftermath, he was entirely correct. We need not just more equipment, we need a political policy that provides a foundation to bring this to a resolution.

□ 2245

And in order to accomplish that, we have to have sufficient personnel unto the date, and the Secretary of Defense and the President consistently have denied this to our people in the field and indicated to me shamefully all along if they wanted more, all they have to do is ask. We know what the message is. The message is they are not here; they cannot be there. And why? I will tell the Members. Because many members of our committee, Republican and Democrat alike, and when I say our committee, the Committee on Armed Services, have tried for several years now to increase the number of people in the Army and the Marine Corps, that is to say that can be recruited and retained as active-duty forces. It is called end strength. What is the end strength? The end of the numbers that we have in the Armed Forces. We said, absent a significant increase in the number of Army troops and Marines available, we inevitably would have to call on Guard and Reserve.

I beg to differ with the gentleman's remarks and the gentlewoman's remarks in one sense only, the phrase

"our young men and women." Let me tell my colleagues something. Tune into the NewsHour with Jim Lehrer every night on PBS, and respectfully and with dignity they close every program in silence with the pictures and short biographies of the people who have been killed, and chills run down my arm as I reach out to say it, and we see over and over again sergeant so and so, 43 years old; master sergeant somebody, 50-something years old; 38 years old. These are teachers. These are police officers. These are fire fighters. These are Guard and Reservists. They are not young men and women. Not that being young in itself makes one a candidate for these pictures, but that is who we tend to think of. This is a volunteer force, and the Guard and Reserves are volunteers, and they are being shamelessly exploited in this sense. We now have a draft in this country. We have a draft by default because the Guard and Reserve are being pulled into active-duty service and their terms of enlistment are being extended arbitrarily by the Department of Defense.

Therefore, I conclude, and thank the gentleman for yielding, by saying, yes, we have to provide the equipment; but we have to provide the people and the policy behind it that will allow us to resolve this issue.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, a point well taken because I have had three of my constituents killed in this war. The last one I heard about today, a 21-year-old Marine who had served time in Iraq came home for a brief period of time and was married, was sent back, and was killed in an explosion last Saturday, 21 years old. Earlier than that, a couple of months ago, a 20-year-old, but a 37-year-old as well with three children, a 15-year-old son and two young daughters. So my friend is correct. Young people, middle-aged people are losing their lives.

And I would just say this before I yield to my friend from Texas. This has been the most costly month of this war. We are not through this month yet, but we have already lost over 100 precious American lives just this month, well more than a year after this war started. And I just wonder if the President had told the American people before we went to war that it was going to cost \$150 billion plus billions and billions and billions more in the years to come, if it was going to cost more than 700 precious American lives, if it was going to result in about 3,500 to 4,000 being seriously wounded, if we were going to be there not for a year or 2 years, but perhaps 5 or 10 or more years, if there were no weapons of mass destruction, if he had said to the American people Iraq was not responsible for the attack upon our country and we have no reason to believe there is a connection between Iraq and the al Qaeda terrorism network, I just wonder under those circumstances what the reaction of the American people would be.

But the fact is that Vice President CHENEY, we now know as a result of Bob Woodward's book, and Mr. Wolfowitz and Richard Pearl and others had decided that this is what we needed to do and so they manipulated and distorted and exaggerated and shaved the truth, and we find ourselves now in a situation where our troops are not being well equipped, not being well equipped in spite of what the President says in his press conference, not being well equipped, and I believe that those who were responsible for persuading this President to take us to war under these circumstances were immature in their understanding of history, were naive in their understanding of what war is all about, and to this very day refuse to acknowledge their mistakes.

Some may say, why talk about the past? We are there now. We have got to deal with this. And that is true. We cannot just leave. We are there, and we have got to deal with this terrible situation. But the reason we need to talk about how we got into this situation is because those who got us there are still in power and they want the ability to make the decisions for the future. They want the ability to make decisions about what this country is going to do with our military, with our foreign policy, years into the future. And that is why we need to talk about this issue, because the American people need to learn the truth, and they need to know the complete story.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio's remarks, and of course the gentleman from Hawaii has made a very pointed statement. I guess my optimism is that all of them are young men and women with futures before them, and I recognize that we embrace that population of youth, which ranges from the early teens or the late teens all the way up to the ages that the gentleman has cited, each and everyone of them have committed themselves to going forward to provide the kind of protection for this country and to uphold their oath.

I guess I rise today to follow up on several points that remain. But in particular I just want to take a very quiet moment to acknowledge that this Nation is not filled with wimps. There is no one that would step aside when the Nation's, if the Members will, dignity and honor need to be defended. None of us would run away from defending a Nation that had been attacked. None of us would go against the efforts to fight the war on terrorism. In fact, we have been united in the war on terrorism. This Nation has rallied in World War II, in the Korean War. We even rallied in the Vietnam War. We asked hard questions. It was controversial, but we were united. But we understood that we needed to learn a lesson from Vietnam. We were united, even though there were political differences, ultimately in the Gulf War, and it was one

of the largest collaborations that we have seen around the world.

What I really struggle with here in these days of the Iraq war are several points, and the gentleman has made them. But, first of all, I have struggled with the direct and pronounced and distinct misrepresentations to the American people. We have yet to find weapons of mass destruction, nor can we find the connection to 9/11.

And then my good friend from Hawaii has said it very clearly. We have young soldiers there. In the headlines in *The Washington Post*, "Disappointed troops face extended tour with the need to get over it." Part of their extended tour is the very fact of what the distinguished gentleman has said, not enough troops; and so therefore we are keeping those who are bruised and battered and torn and worn; yet their spirits are responding to our call. But we are keeping people over there who have, in fact, done their service. And this particular battalion is now going to have to stay an extra 4 months.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman agree then that that is a draft by default?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, that is a draft by default. He made an excellent point. And in the shadow of the draft by default is the constant dying of these soldiers for lack of equipment, for lack of a plan. For there are many of us on this floor that have agreed with the war resolution and disagreed with the war resolution.

I have been to Iraq. Most of us or many of us have been to Iraq. And what we all agree with is that there must be a plan to follow through either on an exit or for the maintenance and reconciliation of peace.

My good, distinguished friend has already said there is corruption there, that money is flowing in and out that cannot be accounted for. And so the safety of Fallujah is not the only question we have in mind. It is the question of what is the plan. What is the plan to understand the people in Fallujah and to understand, once the governing council makes a deal, whether or not the citizens of Fallujah are going to adhere to it? It is to understand that we cannot put different groups in a battalion of Iraqis, Shiites, and Sunnis and others, and then ask the question when they go into battle why they dispersed and either go in alliance with those who are fighting our troops. Because this administration does not have a plan. And because they do not have a plan, in the city, in the metropolitan area of Houston over this last weekend, we lost 11 individuals in that area, 11 loved ones, 11 personnel in that area, 11 families mourning.

So this is not a question now of politics as much as it is what is the future of this war. What is the recognition by this administration that people are dying and that they are not in any way objecting to dying for a cause, but the question is can the administration in

good faith suggest there is a cause, suggest that we have a plan, suggest that we have a solution to be victorious.

And let me just say this: the gentleman had it right, and the headline reads in *The Washington Post*, which is taken from the Woodward book, "Cheney was unwavering in desire to go to war."

Let me just say this: my understanding is that we have three branches of government, the judiciary, the executive, and the legislature. I have never been told that a declaration of war, decision to war, is that of one person, be that person the Vice President of the United States or maybe even one Member of Congress, who has the right to send this Nation into war. So I am at a loss as to the power of the Vice President to singularly take the United States into battle. He has no solution now. I do not know whether Mr. Wolfowitz has a solution. Certainly Mr. Rumsfeld, who indicated a couple of weeks ago he was surprised with the response, and this happens to be the Secretary of Defense who is over our United States military, he is telling us he is surprised, while mothers' children are dying or fathers' children are dying. What an outrage.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that bothers me about this administration and its apparently overwhelming desire to go to war was the fact that according to the Woodward book that in January the President and I believe Mr. Rumsfeld met with Prince Bandar, this Saudi ambassador, this prince, in the White House and informed him of our plans to go to war with Iraq, and according to Mr. Woodward, this happened before the President even told our own Secretary of State, Colin Powell. Mr. Powell is now disputing that account, I believe. But the fact is why would the President discuss his plans to go to war with this ambassador from Saudi Arabia before he informs the Congress of the United States and talks to the American people about this?

Fifteen of the 19 pilots that were involved in the attack upon our country on September 11, 2001, were Saudi Arabian citizens. There is an unusual relationship between the Bush family and the Saudi royal family. It is starting to come out. I do not know if that has anything to do with the fact that a few days after the attack upon our country, Saudi citizens were allowed to be flown out of this country at a time when all of the other private aircraft were grounded and planes went all over this country picking up Saudi citizens and some relatives of Osama bin Laden and flew them out of this country before they were thoroughly questioned and vetted by the FBI. Why would that have happened? It is almost beyond belief.

□ 2300

Now, Mr. Woodward implies in his book that there may be a secret deal

between this administration and the Saudi Government regarding the cost of gasoline; that they have been asked to lower the price of oil before the election so that the election prospects of President Bush may be enhanced.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is true, but I know that is what Mr. Woodward says in his book, and Mr. Woodward is a very credible author, widely respected journalist, who had access to Colin Powell and to the President, and he makes that accusation in his book.

Now, the American people are paying outrageously high gasoline prices today, outrageously high. Secretary Abraham, the Secretary of Energy, was before my committee not many days ago, and we asked him in that committee meeting, has the President called the members of the Saudi royal family and asked them to do something about these outrageous oil prices?

Well, apparently not. In fact, the Saudi family cooperated with OPEC in voting to cut production, which has had the effect of raising prices. So during the spring and summer, the American citizens are paying these outrageous gasoline prices, and, apparently, if Mr. Woodward is correct, maybe in late fall we will find that the Saudis suddenly decide to increase production, thereby lowering the cost of gasoline and making the President a hero. Now is when the American consumer needs help with these high gasoline prices, not in September or October.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If the gentleman will yield a moment on that, I just want to ask a question at this point: Would the gentleman agree then that the President of the United States is all for free trade, unless it happens to be with oil, and in that instance then he seems to have no problem at all with a cartel being able to decide how much it is going to produce, when it is going to produce it and how much it is going to charge for it?

Would the gentleman agree that when it comes to free trade, that is a foreign term to the President, that is a foreign term to the free trade people in this country, who want us to be able to send our jobs overseas, want free trade and the free circulation of international funds for the purpose of that trade, except when it comes to oil and the oil cartels?

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there is only one other exception, and that is prescription medications. The administration does not believe in free trade when it comes to prescription medications, because we can trade everything else with Mexico and Canada except medications, and the pharmaceutical companies do not want that.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I yield to the gentleman the point that international robbery from pharmaceutical companies is right up there next to, if not parallel exactly, with the oil cartels.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I thank my friend, and I yield to my colleague the

gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is overwhelming in terms of the mounting evidence that we have seen presented over the last couple of days and weeks that goes to the point that I made, that the decision to go to war was somewhere outside of the constitutional parameters that we should adhere to.

Frankly, we were misrepresented to in terms of making a decision on this floor, and then we have come to find out that maybe even in the executive branch, the appropriate officials were not given at least the opportunity to give and take, and that this was in fact the singular decision of at least one individual, and then maybe two or three others. So we have a real problem.

If I might, as I close, say this: I am going to apologize to the American people. We know that the 9/11 Commission hearings were held over the last 10 days, and a number of administration officials came forward.

I guess I come from the old-fashioned home training. My parents and grandparents always said that there is some dignity in an apology. It does not in any way suggest that you are weak, that you have no strength. In fact, it is all about character, that you can acknowledge that you have made a misstep or mistake. Then you begin to gather around so that you can embrace ways of improving your good condition.

When I see those men and women of all ages in the military hospitals losing limbs, multiple limbs, quadriplegic, blinded in both eyes, heads dented in from wounds, I wonder what I can say to their children, looking for them to come and play Little League or football, their wives, their mothers and fathers.

So I just want to come to the floor this evening and join my colleagues, but I want it to be known that I apologize on behalf of this country and am ashamed by the fact that officials went before the 9/11 Commission, and I know that the two are distinct in some sense, 9/11, of course, referring to the tragedy of 9/11 in New York and in Pennsylvania and in Washington. But it was overlapping, that as the 9/11 was used for us to go into Iraq, and we lost those precious lives and we should have been committed to a vast war against terrorism, bringing in all the allies that we could muster, so that we would be able to stomp out the devastation of terrorism. Yet we got distracted, and now we have men and women dying in Iraq, and we are at a loss to find out what the cause is.

We are hearing that there is infiltration of corruption with dollars that we have sent over there. We are understanding that no matter if you are in a convey of civilians, even the civilians are not safe. Family members who have sent civilians over just to get an honest day's earnings for an honest

day's work are in jeopardy of their lives. Even our corporations who are working over there with their personnel are jeopardized because they are not getting a fair shake to be able to do the work they were supposed to do and as well to have their personnel protected.

So, I would just say to my colleagues, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), first of all, for giving me this time to join him and to join the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), and be able to say that together in this Congress we have got to find a way to restore the constitutional parameters and to restore the authority of the United States Congress to ask the hard questions; to support the United States military, as we have done collectively, to provide the resources; to ask the President why, and to expect, I might say, an apology, which does not in any way diminish the Commander-in-Chief's role of leading the troops; but to be able to say that with all that has come out, I know we have made some missteps, and I apologize to those who have lost their lives, their family members, bereaved members who now have to be left alone.

There is one final point I want to make, and maybe the gentleman did not hear it, but I want to get the transcript so I am not misstating, because I thought I heard in the press conference some words about "I am disappointed in some of the performances of the troops." I am still trying to research that, the President's press conference. I was shocked that I might have heard those words. I cannot imagine how can you can be disappointed in some of those performances when they do not have all of the equipment they needed to have.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to end on one note and make it very clear, I am apologizing, and I am not ashamed of doing so. I believe that this Congress needs to stand up and take responsibility for how we are going to gain dignity by responding, if you will, to the needs of the United States military in the crisis that they are in in Iraq and provide them the necessary equipment and plan for them to be able to exit in dignity and to have the success of the rebuild of Iraq with an expanded coalition, what we should be engaged in at this time.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentlewoman from Texas made a very, very strong point of the necessity, I believe I am quoting her correctly, that we have to find a way. We have to find a way to get this message out. We have to find a way to get our message, we have to find a way to engage the American people in a discussion and a dialogue. That is what we are trying to do here.

To the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), if you would indulge me for a moment in yielding, I think it might be apropos that we do take upon

ourselves the admonition of the gentlewoman from Texas. We have to find a way.

This is our way. Not everyone may understand what it is. They may be going up and down the television and see what is going on. This is called Special Orders. Special Orders means the regular business of the House, that is to say the scheduled business of the House, is completed for the day. This is our opportunity as Representatives, this is the opportunity of the 435 of us, who have had the faith and trust of our constituents placed in us, to come to the floor and engage in a dialogue not just with ourselves, but with the American people. Because part of the difficulty has been is the American people are watching this on television, or reading it in the newspaper, participating, if you will, at a distance, as to what is taking place, unless and until, of course, it hits you full force because a loved one has been hurt or harmed or killed, or someone that you know has had that experience. So it happens sporadically, and, from the point of view of the cosmos, indifferently around the country at various times.

So we are here on the floor, and I might say to those tuning in, we are here on the floor of the House of Representatives, surrounded by the galleries. In fact, our good friend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has a group of his constituents in this gallery right now observing our proceedings.

□ 2310

He is explaining to them as we are speaking now what it is we are doing on the floor here. It does not matter that the Chamber is not filled right now.

We spent our time this afternoon naming post offices. I was happy to do it. A good friend of mine had one of the post offices named after him. I was pleased to cast my vote for it. A wonderful opportunity to show our expression of what we would say in Hawaii is "aloha" for our good friend and others. We were happy to do that.

But our business here in these Special Orders is to engage the American people as best we can with that which we have before us. And as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) now is talking with his constituents here in the gallery, this is the freedom granted to us by the Constitution that we need to take advantage of, that we were obligated to take advantage of.

So the regret to me is, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) no doubt has pointed out, right behind me here is the press gallery. Empty. Night after night empty. Now, maybe they can say, well, they are watching on television, if they care to.

But who wants to pay attention to Special Orders? Well, I will tell my colleagues what happens in Special Orders. Not just this kind of discussion, but my good friend, the gentleman

from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), night after night engaged in a conversation on the Social Security trust fund, what it takes to make the Social Security trust fund.

In fact, he just walked in right now. That is synchronicity. I did not know he was coming. Did my colleague happen to hear what I had to say? I do not know whether the cameras are on us or not. But the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) has just come in.

I cite him as an example, as a prime example of someone who has faithfully come to the floor to explain his position on the Social Security trust fund, the implications of it for our country. That is the kind of thing that needs to be done. That is what this is about.

This Iraq Watch that we have faithfully committed ourselves to since the beginning of our concern that this war was going off on the wrong track, that this was taking place, that is why we are here. That is why I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I appreciate the fact that our good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), and his constituents have observed us this evening, have seen democracy in action.

I am here to tell you as far as this gentleman is concerned, that I am going to take advantage of this opportunity that we have here on the floor and continue to exchange in the kind of dialogue that I hope will illuminate the issues of our day so that we can get a resolution on behalf of these brave men and women who are serving our country.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), for joining us and thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), in closing so the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) can have his time to talk about his concerns.

I go back to something that I mentioned earlier in this time together and that is the fact that this very night we have young soldiers and middle-age soldiers in Iraq driving around in Humvees that are not armored. It puts them at greater risk. This problem can be solved much more quickly than the Pentagon is willing to solve it.

I talked to a radio personality back in my district today and she said, "Congressman, what can the people listening do about this?" I said, "Call the White House. The message ought to be this: Mr. President, provide our soldiers with armored Humvees as quickly as possible because life and limb are at stake."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNS). The Chair must remind Members to avoid improper allusions to visitors in the galleries.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND GOING DEEPER INTO DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for the time remaining until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) said, yes, we have had many conversations about Social Security including the stealing of the extra trust fund surplus that has been coming in. We have never been quite square with the American people.

I would yield to my colleague.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH). As one can see, the aura that he exudes when he comes to speak about Social Security must have been so powerful that the rays literally leapt out and said to me, say that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is coming.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of Hawaii are still wide awake and listening to this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to comment tonight not only on Social Security but what I consider a huge challenge for this country, and that is going deeper into debt and increasing the spending of the Federal Government and sacrificing the increased burdens of that increasing debt in addition to the kind of high taxes that it takes to accommodate this kind of spending and this kind of servicing of the debt.

The first chart I have is a pie chart that I wanted to sort of show how the Federal Government is spending \$2.4 trillion. And we see the largest piece of this pie is Social Security, spending 21 percent of all Federal spending; and that is going up.

In 1983 we had the Greenspan Commission that gathered together because Social Security was going broke, and what they decided is to dramatically increase taxes, payroll taxes, our FICA taxes, for Social Security and at the same time reduce benefits. And that is the challenge for Social Security, that is the challenge for Medicare, that is certainly the challenge for Medicaid, the three major programs where Members of Congress have continued to make promises over and above far beyond our ability to pay for them in the future. And that is the problem with extra pressure on increasing taxes and increasing debt on these kind of unfunded liabilities.

We see the other pieces of the pie. Defense is 20 percent; 2 years ago it was 19 percent.

Interest. Look at this issue of interest on the debt. It is now 14 percent of total spending. Within 6 to 8 years that amount of the piece of pie that interest consumes servicing this increasing national debt is probably going to double.

Now, interest rates right now are almost at record lows. We know that interest rates eventually are going to increase. And so increasing interest rates

in addition to the increased debt is going to consume a lot larger piece of the total Federal spending.

Then how do we accommodate that increased spending? Do we simply say, well, we are going to increase debt more or increase taxes more? Increasing debt puts additional pressure on the interest rates which is going to up interest rates and up the cost. If we increase taxes, that puts our businesses at a greater competitive disadvantage to other businesses in other countries that we are competing with.

Right now we charge our business approximately 18 percent more taxes than the taxes that are charged to our major competitors in the major industrialized countries of the world.

The other problem with the increased debt is how fast government is growing. The debt of this country, we are about 227 years old as a country, it took the first 200 years of this country to amass a debt of \$500 billion. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going deeper in debt over \$500 billion a year. For the past several years, and it looks like as far as we can see into the future, we are continuing to increase debt over \$500 billion a year.

How can we do that? We can do it because Members of Congress have felt that it is in their political interest of getting reelected to expand government programs. And now we are in a situation where almost one-half of the adult population in the United States pays less than 1 percent of the total income tax so they do not have a lot at stake in terms of their pocketbook. So it is easier for that population to elect representatives that promise them more and more Federal programs, more and more Federal spending.

Look, there is no limit to the problems in the United States.

□ 2320

But a country that does not pay attention to the major concerns and major problems it is facing ends up being dismantled and diminishes. As strong a country as the United States is, militarily, economically, we cannot survive the kind of unfunded liability and increasing debts that we are accumulating.

Just briefly to go around the pie chart, and then I will go to unfunded liabilities in a second. The domestic discretionary is 16 percent. Other entitlements is 10 percent. Medicaid is 6 percent. Medicare is 12 percent.

Medicare is going to be overtaking Social Security in terms of its percentage of total Federal spending within the next 25 years. Here again, promises we made compounded by the demographics of an increasing retired generation of Americans compared to a relatively small number that are working in this country and paying in their taxes to accommodate Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security and the other programs.

On this next chart, Mr. Speaker, I ask everyone to consider the kind of

promises that we have made over and above our ability to pay for those promises. I call that unfunded liabilities. The massive unfunded liabilities, in other words, the promises we have made in some of these programs over and above the revenue that is coming in to pay for them, is going to become a disastrous challenge for this Nation. And we pass these budgets now, and we do not pay attention to what we are doing to take care of the problems of Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security.

Look at these figures. Medicare Part A, mostly hospitals, is \$21.8 trillion. That is going to be needed in today's dollar value to accommodate the promises that we have made just in Medicare Part A. When I say today's dollar value, in effect, these the accumulations, the sum of the Medicare A, B, Part D, and the Social Security comes to \$73.5 trillion. In other words, we would have to put \$73.5 trillion in a savings account that is going to grow with inflation and probably the time value of money to accommodate the more expensive wage inflation that represents the increase in benefits for many of these programs to accommodate what we are going to have to dig up in the future.

To me, Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable. I hear Democrats say, well, we need more spending, we cannot cut taxes, but Democrats and their budget proposed greater spending than the Republicans did in their budget. But the Republicans, on the other hand, are suggesting in effect, let us borrow more money to accommodate the spending even though we start slowing down the spending. This year, probably the best year since 1995, 1996, we are holding spending down. But even so, Mr. Speaker, holding down this spending, we are still ending up with an increased expansion of the size of the Federal Government that is almost three times the rate of inflation.

So just imagine for a moment if you project this out, and the size of government is growing three times as fast as inflation, then we are going to have such an empowered Federal Government with such great dependency from the American people that even more Americans are going to call for more government services. I think as you look at the unfunded liabilities of \$73.5 trillion, Medicare Part B, mostly doctors, \$23.2 trillion. Medicare Part D is \$16.6 trillion. Medicare Part D is the new prescription drug bill that we passed. That is interesting.

Last November the projections for the unfunded liability were about \$7.5 trillion for the Medicare prescription drug program. Now with the actuary's report that came out about 4 weeks ago, the Medicare and the Social Security actuaries' report, the new estimate is \$16.6 trillion unfunded liability. So skyrocketing costs, prescription drugs are sometimes the kind of medical technology that can keep people out of the hospitals. And so if you go in

the hospital and you are on Medicare, then your prescriptions are covered. So it is reasonable for some of those drugs to be covered. But to have such a huge expansion of this program without cutting back and reforming the system so that it can survive and so it is sound financially again I think is a great mistake.

And of course, I had a tough night that night. I ended up voting against the prescription drug program because I am so concerned that we are digging a deeper hole in terms of the challenge that we are putting on our kids and our grandkids and our great-grandkids to try to pay back what we now consider is our justified overspending.

And think about that just for a moment. Do we pretend that their problems are not going to be as great or as challenging in the next generations, 10, 20, 30, 40 years from now? Because that is what you would have to assume when we see Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate, vote to expand spending to the extent that we are, continuing borrowing the money and expect future generations to pay off that debt.

Social Security, the Social Security Trust Fund's IOUs, we are going to have to come up with \$12 trillion to accommodate the increased promises for future Social Security retirees. About \$12 trillion, between 11-, it is between 11.9 and 12.2 that we are going to need over and above the Social Security FICA tax. That is 6.2 percent of what you earned for the employee, another 6.2 percent paid by the employer. But make no mistake, it all comes out of the employee's pocket. We are going to need that \$12 trillion over and above what is coming in over the next 75 years to pay for promised benefits.

How do we get this Congress' attention? I think, Mr. Speaker, the way to get the attention of Members of Congress is for voters in the United States, this election and every election, to say to individuals that are running for the House, that are running for the Senate, that are running for the President, look, what are you going to do about all of these promises that you cannot pay for? What are you going to do about the increasing debt that you are passing on to our kids and our grandkids, pretending that your problems today are so much greater than theirs? How do we get their attention? I think that is how we get their attention.

I think the American people have got to start realizing that you cannot just have government, some money that is printed in Washington, pay for more and more of the problems of America and more and more of the problems of the world.

We are in a war. During World War II, I was a little kid, and I collected string. I collected tin foil because Mom and Dad and Uncle Sam said that, look, you need to sacrifice. So during World War II we did. We cut way down on all other spending. Every family in America tried to sacrifice and help fight a

war, and we fought a war, and we won a war. But now we are pretending that it is not a real war, and there is no reason to justify cutting other spending because it might hurt us politically back home, and, of course, that is what happens.

I was on the Committee on the Budget for my first 8 years in Congress, and you start a new program, and, of course, if they can get funding to continue that program for a second year, it becomes almost like an entitlement, and they form their own lobbyists and special interests to lobby Congress by contributing to campaigns to encourage Members of Congress to continue to contribute and put money in the appropriations process to those programs. And make no mistake, when you take a race track home or a jogging trail or a bike path or a library or any of the other pork barrel projects, the news media probably puts you on television, puts you on the front page cutting the ribbon, and they say, look what our Congressman has brought home.

□ 2330

Here is the problem. When you take pork back home to your District and it is in an appropriation bill, it obligates you as a Member of Congress to vote for everybody else's pork, and now we have put in so many line items of so many pork barrel projects that it has become one of the main reasons that we have expanded Federal Government spending.

This is another bar chart that represents how much money is going to come out of the general fund to accommodate these programs: Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security. If you see the year 2020, for example, 16 years away, unless we raise taxes or otherwise increase borrowing, we are going to have to reach in to the general fund to the extent of 28 percent, taking 28 percent of this general fund, just 16 years from now, to accommodate our overpromises. I say overpromises, maybe it is nice, maybe it is good, but the fact is we do not have the revenue to pay for those promises because what we are doing at the same time is increasing all spending.

We have had increased spending every year that I have been here. Earlier this evening I heard individuals saying, look, President Bush has been using all of the surplus revenues coming in from Social Security and that is bad, but that kind of demagoguery, that does not get us ahead.

The fact is, ever since Social Security started, anytime there has been more money coming in through Democrat administrations, through Republican administrations, through Republican control of the House and Senate and Democrat control of the House and Senate, every year we have spent all the surplus from Social Security coming in. There has never been a year since I have been in Congress and for the last 20 years at least that the total debt of this country has not increased.

We started bragging back in 1995 and 1996 of a lock box, but that did not last long. It was a gimmick phrase. Hopefully it was going to give us the intestinal fortitude to slow down our increase in spending. It did not work. In one year, we took the Social Security surplus and used it to pay down some of the public debt, sort of like changing credit cards, but the total public debt of this country subject to the debt limit never went down. It continued to go up. Now that debt is over \$7 trillion, and within the next four months we are going to have a vote in the House and Senate to, yet again, increase the public debt of this country, and hopefully, we can talk about that vote when it comes up, talk about the fact that we are putting an extra burden on our kids and our grandkids.

See what happens in the year 2030? If we do nothing to change these programs, it is going to take over 50 percent of the current general fund that we spend on the rest of the pie chart that we showed earlier to accommodate Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security. Let me talk a little bit before we close tonight about Social Security.

I was fortunate enough to chair the Bipartisan Task Force on Social Security. Democrats and Republicans, after we heard testimony from the experts for about a year, we all agreed that the longer we put off the solution to Social Security, the more drastic that solution is going to have to be.

With this chart I wanted to just give a quick bird's-eye view of the temporary surplus coming into Social Security, and that is because the taxes were increased so dramatically back in 1983 that we have had a surplus. Now we are anticipating 2017 or 2018 is when there is less money coming in from the Social Security tax than what is required to pay benefits, and there are a lot of people that think that somehow there is a Social Security fund with their name on it. Not so. This is a pay-as-you-go program. Let me just explain that pay-as-you-go program in Social Security.

Current workers pay in their FICA tax for Social Security on Monday, for example, and by Friday it is all sent out in benefits. Current workers pay the benefit of current retirees, and that is what is bringing us into the predicament that we are now facing. When we started Social Security back in 1934, the average age of death was 62, and the official retirement age for benefits was 65. What does that mean? That means that most people died before you paid out anything, and the program was working very well. Now people are living longer, the birthrate has gone down, and we are having a problem.

Here is how Social Security works. Benefits are highly progressive based on earnings. At retirement, all of a worker's wages up to the tax ceiling that is about now \$89,000, all of the wages are indexed to present value using wage inflation. What that means

is and what the next blip says is the best 35 years of earnings are averaged, but for example, if wage inflation doubles, let us say, every 12 years, so if 12 years ago you were making \$20,000, it is calculated on the way your Social Security benefits are calculated to be double that or \$40,000 now. So it is not the actual dollar amount that you earned 10, 20, 30 years ago. It is the wage inflation of what that kind of job would pay today.

Here is how the progressivity of the Social Security system works. If you are a very low income worker, you get almost 90 percent back in Social Security checks of what you were making on your job in payroll, 90 percent of the earnings up to the first \$7,344 is what you get back in Social Security payments. The next space between \$7,300 and \$44,200, you get 32 percent of that back, and then after that you get the 15 percent of earnings above the \$44,000. So the more you earn, the less percentage of what you get back. So if you are a very high income earner, it is a little over 15 percent. If you are a very low income earner, you get back up to 90 percent.

I just put this line in because a lot of people are concerned about the fact that early retirees receive adjusted benefits. It is true. If you retire early at 62, so based on the average life span, a wage benefit is calculated so the person that retires at 62 and now dies at the average age of 86 will get the same benefits as an individual that waits to 65 years old to start taking those benefits. If you wait until 66 or 67, your benefits actually increase in those two following years by 4 percent a year. So sometimes it is to your advantage to wait.

There has been a lot of debate and discussion on should we have personally-owned savings accounts that belong to the individual worker that the government cannot touch and that would bring in more earnings than what Social Security would. When President Roosevelt first came up with the proposal for Social Security, he suggested that it be privately-owned accounts, and it would still be accounts that you were required to put in a certain percentage of what you earn, but they would be in your name and you could not take them out until you retired.

It was interesting searching the archives. Actually, the Senate passed a bill for personally-owned accounts, and the House, the House said, well, government should be responsible and government should take in all the money and the Federal Government should invest it.

□ 2340

I think probably when it went to conference, because it was so soon after the recession, that decision was made, well, we better let government do it instead of having those accounts personally owned. But Social Security is not a good investment. It is a system that

we know is stretched to its limits, and that is because 78 million baby boomers begin retiring in 2008. Social Security spending exceeds tax revenues in 2017. Social Security Trust Funds go broke in 2037.

Now, just a word on the trust funds. As I mentioned earlier, every year there is more money coming in from the Social Security tax than is needed to pay benefits, and right now we are bringing in about \$90 billion more than the benefits. But, again, that runs out in 2017-2018. That is when there is not enough money coming in.

The government writes out an IOU to the Social Security Trust Funds. It spends the money on other government programs or paying off some of the Wall Street debt. But, again, we have never had a year where the total debt of this country has not increased, so we are facing a predicament with Social Security Trust Funds. Even if they are paid back, it means increased borrowing or increased taxes.

I have a chart I hope to get through in a few minutes, because we are going to conclude this evening's session soon, that shows that every time the United States has been in problems with less money coming in than what is needed for Social Security, they have done one of three things. They have either increased taxes or reduced benefits or a combination of both. Usually, it is a combination of both.

Here is a pictorial view of the demographic problems of fewer and fewer people that are working and paying for the benefits of retirees. In 1947, there were 34 working Americans paying in their Social Security tax for every retiree. By the year 2000, it got down to three. The estimate is that by 2025 there is going to be two American workers paying an increased amount of Social Security tax to accommodate every retiree.

A lot of people say that economic growth will not fix Social Security. Social Security benefits are indexed to wage growth. So if you have a strong economy, and there is more jobs and higher wages, because you are paying in on those more jobs and higher wages temporarily, there is more money coming in to Social Security. But in the long run, when that person or that increased number retires, then there is more money going out of Social Security. So economic expansion, because of the fact that Social Security benefits are directly indexed to how much you were making when you were paying in, does not solve the problem. It simply tends to fill the hole a little in the early years, but it leaves a bigger hole in the later years.

The fact is that it is going to take more than economic growth to fix Social Security. And to think that you can fix Social Security simply by upping taxes again only solves the problem in the short run. We have to end up with a better return on those Social Security benefits.

As I make speeches around the country and around my Seventh District in

Michigan, a lot of people say, look, if government would keep their cotton-picking hands off the Social Security Trust Fund money, then everything would be okay. And I agree with that, we should keep our hands off that Social Security surplus. It should be really invested instead of spent on other programs. But to represent how great the problem is, what the challenge really is to Social Security, I did this bar chart.

Right now what we have borrowed from Social Security, taking all the extra money in every year, plus paying interest on it, the IOUs now amount to \$1.4 trillion. But the extent of the Social Security unfunded liability problem is between \$11.9 trillion and \$12.4 trillion. So I use the figure \$12.2 trillion as far as the unfunded liability. That is, again, what we need in today's dollars over and above what is going to be coming in from the Social Security tax.

The Social Security Trust Fund contains nothing but IOUs. To keep paying promised Social Security benefits, the payroll tax will have to be increased by nearly 50 percent, or benefits will have to be cut by 30 percent. To me, this shows why Social Security is not a good investment. The real return on Social Security, the return of what you and your employer, or if you are a sole proprietor, of what you pay into Social Security, the return on average is 1.7 percent.

And I compare that, over in the far right chart, which is the Wilshire 5000 Index. Over the last 10 years, even with a bad, poor 3 years on equity investments, still the 5000 equity stocks earned 11.86 percent. Compare that to the 1.7 percent that you receive from Social Security.

This is how many years it takes to break even on your Social Security benefits. By 2005, you have to live 23 years after retirement.

Okay, here, Mr. Speaker, is what we have been doing. Every time we have gotten in some problems, we have simply increased taxes. This chart shows the history of tax increases. In 1940, 2 percent of the first \$3,000. In 1960, they decided to raise it to 6 percent of \$4,800. Then in 1980, we made a big jump to 10.16 percent of the first \$26,000. By the year 2000, 12.4 percent of \$76,000. Now it is 12.4 percent of \$89,000 this next year. So what we have done is continued to increase taxes to the extent that now 78 percent of Americans pay more in the Social Security tax than they do in the income tax.

And that is what that chart says; 78 percent of families pay more in the payroll tax than in the income tax.

Here are six principles that seem reasonable to me as we try to face the challenge of how do we change Social Security, and one of the problems that I faced. I have introduced Social Security bills since I first came to Congress in 1993 that have been scored to keep Social Security solvent. In the changes back in 1993, 1994, 1995 and 1996, I did

not have to borrow any money from the general fund to accommodate some of the changes that would keep Social Security solvent.

The six principles that seem reasonable to me as we protect current and future beneficiaries are that we allow freedom of choice; we preserve the safety net; we make Americans better off, not worse off; we create a fully-funded system; and no tax increases. And maybe, if there is another blip, it should be a system that makes sure that the American economy stays strong instead of the kind of changes such as increased taxes that are going to weaken our economy.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by asking everybody to make a guess of what the FICA tax is in the country of France, for example. Right now the payroll deduction on wages in France is over 50 percent to accommodate the senior population. So no wonder France is having trouble competing. No wonder France did not want to spend any money in Iraq. No wonder there are demonstrations in France, because if you are paying a 50 percent tax on wages that you have to withhold, then you have two options. You either increase the price of your product, that makes you less competitive, or you increase the wages you pay to your worker. Let us not allow America and the United States to get into that kind of predicament.

Germany just went over 40 percent of payroll tax. So, again, Germany is discovering that it is much more difficult to compete.

Mr. Speaker, I would again encourage my colleagues and I would encourage the American people to start talking to their candidates that are running for Congress, that are running for the Senate, that are running for President of the United States. What is their plan in the long range to save Social Security, to keep Social Security solvent, to save Medicare and Medicaid and keep those programs solvent? It is a huge challenge, and we should be willing to face up to it.

□ 2350

Mr. Speaker, we have had a system in this country where those who work hard and save and try and invest end up better than those who do not. So to continue to increase taxes on those individuals that do save and do try and do invest is going to discourage some of the motivation and incentives that have made this country great. Let us deal with these problems now. Great empires that put off solutions to important problems are those kinds of empires that collapse. Let us not allow that in America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FROST (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIERNEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIERNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today and April 21.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY, for 5 minutes, April 21 and 22.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, April 22.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and April 21 and 22.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, April 22.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 129. An act to provide for reform relating to Federal employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

S. 1108. An act to establish within the National Park Service the 225th anniversary of the American Revolution Commemorative Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on April 2, 2004 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 4062. To provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through June 4, 2004, and for other purposes.

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on April 9, 2004 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3108. To amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily replace the 30-year Treasury rate with a rate based on long-term corporate bonds for certain pension plan funding requirements and other provisions, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

H.R. 3108. An Act to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily replace the 30-year Treasury rate with a rate based on long-term corporate bonds for certain pension plan funding requirements and other provisions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 21, 2004, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7558. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fosthiazate; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2003-0296; FRL-7339-4] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7559. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hygromycin B phosphotransferase; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2004-0036; FRL-7352-8] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7560. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lambda-Cyhalothrin and an Isomer Gamma-Cyhalothrin; Tolerances for Residues [OPP-2004-0025; FRL-7353-4] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7561. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mesosulfuron-Methyl; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2003-0257; FRL-7351-4] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7562. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Certification that the Multi-mission Maritime Aircraft (MMA) survivability testing, otherwise required by section 2366, would be unreasonably expensive and impracticable, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2366(c)(2); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7563. A letter from the Director, Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting Notification of intent to obligate funds for three new test projects for inclusion in the Fiscal Year 2004 Foreign Comparative Testing (FCT) Program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7564. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report identifying, for each of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) and each Defense Agency, the percentage of funds that are projected to be expended during each of the next five fiscal years for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2466(d)(2); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7565. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on assistance provided by the Department of Defense (DoD) to civilian sporting events in support of essential security and safety, covering the period of calendar year 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7566. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Larry R. Ellis, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7567. A letter from the Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting a letter on the details of the Office's 2004 compensation plan, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1833b; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7568. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the combined forty-seventh and forty-eighth reports outlining the status of Exxon and Stripper Well Oil Overcharge Funds as of September 30, 2003, satisfying the request set forth in the Conference Report accompanying the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-202); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7569. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Accidental Release Prevention Requirements; Risk Management Program Requirements Under Clean Air Act Section 112(r)(7); Amendments to the Submission Schedule and Data Requirements [OAR-2003-0044; FRL-7643-6] (RIN: 2050-AF09) received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7570. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida Broward County Aviation Department Variance [R04-OAR-2003-FL-0001-200414(a); FRL-7643-3] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7571. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Interstate Ozone Transport; Response to Court Decisions on the NOx SIP Call, NOx SIP Call Technical Amendments, and Section 126 Rules [FRL-7644-7] (RIN: 2060-AJ16) received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7572. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lead; Notification Requirements for Lead-Based Paint Abatement Activities and Training [OPPT-2003-0061; FRL-7341-5] (RIN: 2070-AD31) received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7573. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal 03-04 informing of an intent to sign an Amendment to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Counterterrorism Research and Development between the United States and Canada, pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

7574. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on nuclear nonproliferation in South Asia for the period October 1, 2003 to March 31, 2004, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2376(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

7575. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and defense articles to Italy and Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 010-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

7576. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad with Australia, New Zealand, and Canada (Transmittal No. DDTC 003-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

7577. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed transfer of major defense equipment from the Government of the United Arab Emirates (UAEG) (Transmittal RSAT-1-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

7578. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Denial Policy Against Iraq (RIN: 1400-ZA09) received April 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7579. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the FY 2003 management report and independent financial audit, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 4127; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7580. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting in accordance with the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (FAIR Act), the Year 2003 A-76 Inventory of Commercial Activities for FY 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7581. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7582. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7583. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Resources Management, Department

of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7584. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Resources Management, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7585. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2004 through 2009, as required by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7586. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7587. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7588. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7589. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting the Commercial Activities Inventory for FY 2003 as required by the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (the FAIR ACT); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7590. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting in accordance with OMB Circular No. A-11, Part 2, and section 4(b) of the Government Performance and Results Act, the Commission's Annual Program Performance Report covering FY 2003; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7591. A letter from the Director and Chief Financial Officer, Holocaust Memorial Museum, transmitting the Performance and Accountability Report (PAR) for Fiscal Year 2003 for the Museum as required under the Accountability of Tax Dollars (ATD) Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7592. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting the FY 2003 Annual Program Performance Report, prepared in accordance with the provisions of The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7593. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's Annual Financial Statements for FY 2003; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7594. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period of April 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7595. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period of April 1, 2003 to September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7596. A letter from the Chief Judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Superior Court's Family Court Transition Plan, pursuant to Public Law 107-114; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7597. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly re-

port of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 2004 through March 31, 2004 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a; (H. Doc. No. 108-179); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

7598. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting The results of the study to assess the number of untested rape examination kits that currently exist nationwide as described under this section, pursuant to Public Law 107-273, section 304 (116 Stat. 1781); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7599. A letter from the Under Secretary, Emergency Preparedness and Response, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification that funding under Title V, subsection 503(b)(3) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, may exceed \$5 million for the response to the emergency declared as a result of the record/near record snow on December 5-7, 2003, in the State of Connecticut, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7600. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Jensen Beach (SR 707) Bridge, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway mile 981.4, Stuart, FL. [CGD07-04-035] received April, 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7601. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Harlem River, Newton Creek, NY. [CGD01-04-018] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7602. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Piscataqua River, ME. [CGD01-04-022] received April 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7603. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Long Island, New York Inland Waterway from East Rockaway Inlet to Shinnecock Canal, NY. [CGD01-04-008] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7604. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Bayou Portage, Pass Christian, MS [CGD08-04-007] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7605. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway — Black Bayou, LA. [CGD08-04-008] received April 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7606. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; St. Johns River, mile 24.7 at Jacksonville, Duval County, FL. [CGD07-

04-033] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7607. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Suisan Bay, Concord, California [COTP San Francisco Bay 04-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7608. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class D Airspace; Cannon Air Force Base, NM [Docket No. FAA-2003-15249; Airspace Docket No. 2003-ASW-4] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7609. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Iowa City, IA. [Docket No. FAA-2004-17143; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-9] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7610. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Iowa Falls, IA. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16747; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-91] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7611. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Clay Center, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16759; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-96] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7612. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Fort Scott, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2003-16761; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-98] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7613. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Charleston, MO. [Docket No. FAA-2004-17146; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-12] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7614. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class E Airspace; Angel Fire, NM [Docket No. FAA-2003-15246; Airspace Docket No. 2003-ASW-1] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7615. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class D Airspace; Little Rock AFB, AR [Docket No. FAA-2003-15247; Airspace Docket No. 2003-ASW-2] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7616. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule —

Modification of Class D Airspace; Rapid City, SD [Docket No. FAA-2003-16147; Airspace Docket No. 03-AGL-17] received April 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7617. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a package of material, containing the State of the Chesapeake Bay report (July 2002), a compilation of key Chesapeake Bay environmental indicators, a summary report on Land Cover Change in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, and a report entitled Chesapeake Bay Program Institutional Governance Analysis: Participation by the Headquarters States of DE, NY and WV; representing the Agency's fulfillment of its obligation under Section 117(h) of the Clean Water Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7618. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, transmitting the reports of the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations, and the policy, sectoral, and functional trade advisory committees chartered under those Acts, on the U.S.-Morocco Free Trade Agreement, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2155(e)(1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7619. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of an intent to transfer funds from the Defense Working Capital Funds to the Operation and Maintenance Appropriations of the Army and the Navy, pursuant to Public Law 108—87, section 8006; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations.

7620. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination that, at this time, the Secretary cannot certify that the Government of Serbia and Montenegro (formerly the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) has met the condition for certification in Section 572(c) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations, 2004 (P.L. 108-199) regarding cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

7621. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Defense, transmitting Consistent with the requirements of Public Law 106-65, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000," section 1402, "Annual Report on Transfers of Militarily Sensitive Technology to Countries and Entities of Concern," October 5, 1999, the results of the assessment of policies and procedures related to the export of technologies and technical information to countries and entities of concern; jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

7622. A letter from the Principal Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's legislative initiatives for inclusion in the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2005; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on April 1, 2004 the following report was filed on April 14, 2004]

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 3970. A bill to provide for the implemen-

tation of a Green Chemistry Research and Development Program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on April 20, 2004]

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2131. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to President Jose Maria Aznar of Spain (Rept. 108-463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2693. A bill to reauthorize the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 4030. A bill to establish the Congressional Medal for Outstanding Contributions in Math and Science Education program to recognize private entities for their outstanding contributions to elementary and secondary science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education; with an amendment (Rept. 108-465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. POMBO (by request):

H.R. 4170. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to recruit volunteers to assist with, or facilitate, the activities of various agencies and offices of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon):

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that soldiers serving in a combat zone do not lose eligibility for the refundable child tax credit by reason of receiving nontaxable combat pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 4172. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify certain additional diseases as establishing a presumption of service-connection when occurring in veterans exposed to ionizing radiation during active military, naval, or air service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 4173. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to contract for a report on employment placement, retention, and advancement of recently separated servicemembers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GINGREY (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 4174. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require an individual to provide proof that the individual is a citizen of the United States as a condition of registering to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 4175. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2004, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled

veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES:

H.R. 4176. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 122 West Elwood Avenue in Raeford, North Carolina, as the "Bobby Marshall Gentry Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4177. A bill to establish a Manufacturing and Technology Administration to promote and assist American manufacturers, to provide incentives to American manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Financial Services, International Relations, Government Reform, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 4178. A bill to award posthumously a congressional gold medal to Thurgood Marshall; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 4179. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection for certain specified diseases and disabilities in the case of veterans who were exposed during military service to carbon tetrachloride; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES:

H. Res. 598. A resolution recognizing the valuable contributions of military impacted schools, teachers, administration, and staff for their ongoing contributions to the education of military children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. DELAURO):

H. Res. 599. A resolution congratulating the University of Connecticut Huskies for winning the 2004 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I men and women's basketball championships; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

282. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire, relative to House Resolution 24 memorializing the President of the United States and the United States Congress to develop and work to implement a comprehensive energy plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

283. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1444 Joint Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to give serious consideration to giving the Passamaquoddy Tribe of Maine a cultural exemption from the federal Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972; to the Committee on Resources.

284. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to Senate

Joint Memorial 34 memorializing the United States Congress to enact and the President to sign legislation that would define the political status options available to the United States citizens of Puerto Rico and authorize a plebiscite to provide an opportunity for Puerto Ricans to make an informed decision regarding their future political status; to the Committee on Resources.

285. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1433 Joint Resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to ensure the protection of civil liberties and the security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

286. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 91 memorializing the United States Congress to protect the fundamental institution of marriage as a union between a man and a woman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

287. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 179 memorializing the United States Congress to enact legislation to reduce the threshold of eligibility for Prisoner of War benefits to one day of imprisonment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

288. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Resolution memorializing the United States Congress to extend and make retroactive the Federal Temporary Unemployment Compensation Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

289. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 170 memorializing the United States Congress and the United States Department of Health and Human Services to make the treatment of chronic diseases a higher priority; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Submitted April 14, 2004]

H.R. 3970: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. FILNER.

[Submitted April 20, 2004]

H.R. 369: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 391: Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 394: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 548: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 570: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 571: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 594: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 716: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.R. 742: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 776: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 821: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 843: Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 850: Mr. VITTER.
H.R. 857: Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 898: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 932: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 936: Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 947: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1002: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1039: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1051: Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1057: Mr. HERGER, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1064: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 1117: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1160: Mr. BELL and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1231: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1281: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1310: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1345: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1359: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1406: Mr. WAMP and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1508: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1540: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1563: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1613: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1615: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1688: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 1700: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.

H.R. 1735: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. LEE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1779: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COLE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. CHOCOLA.

H.R. 1823: Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 1824: Mr. STARK, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1863: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STARK, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1905: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1933: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1981: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2071: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2096: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 2239: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2256: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2260: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2265: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 2303: Mr. BURNS.
H.R. 2318: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2333: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2366: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2519: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 2527: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2582: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 2593: Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 2612: Mr. FILNER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2665: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2702: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 2718: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2727: Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 2747: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 2797: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 2821: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2850: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2890: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2905: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 2915: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2932: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2945: Mr. UDALL of Mexico.

H.R. 2950: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 3014: Mr. NADLER and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3015: Mr. FORBES and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 3069: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 3090: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 3103: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H.R. 3213: Mr. DEMINT.
 H.R. 3243: Mr. BURNS and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 3277: Mr. BURR.
 H.R. 3281: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 3344: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
 H.R. 3352: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 3386: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 3438: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 3459: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 3460: Mr. CARDOZA.
 H.R. 3473: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 3474: Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CANNON, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 3574: Mr. COX, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. MANZULLO, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 3579: Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 3615: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 3643: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 3676: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 3715: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 3763: Mr. CHOCOLA.
 H.R. 3773: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, and Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 3791: Mr. DEMINT.
 H.R. 3796: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 3800: Mr. KELLER and Mr. GIBBONS.
 H.R. 3801: Mr. ISSA, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. GIBBONS.
 H.R. 3814: Mr. PENCE.
 H.R. 3820: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 3839: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 3847: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 3859: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
 H.R. 3860: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
 H.R. 3886: Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 3896: Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 3919: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 3921: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 3936: Mr. FILNER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 3968: Mr. HOFFEL.
 H.R. 3981: Mr. EVERETT.
 H.R. 3987: Mr. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 4010: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 4011: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. TIAHRT.
 H.R. 4014: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 4020: Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 4026: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 4030: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 4032: Mr. SNYDER and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 4033: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 4043: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 4052: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BASS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. CUBIN.
 H.R. 4061: Ms. WATSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. HOUGHTON.
 H.R. 4063: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 4072: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 4100: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 4120: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 4129: Mr. CANNON and Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 4130: Mr. FROST, Mr. BOYD, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. DICKS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 4140: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 4154: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 4156: Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.J. Res. 62: Mr. SHAYS.
 H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
 H. Con. Res. 304: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H. Con. Res. 310: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
 H. Con. Res. 311: Mr. CARDOZA.
 H. Con. Res. 314: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 332: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 343: Mr. STENHOLM.
 H. Con. Res. 362: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H. Con. Res. 366: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DICKS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. SPRATT.
 H. Con. Res. 371: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. JOHN.
 H. Con. Res. 375: Mr. SPRATT.
 H. Con. Res. 381: Mr. LEVIN.
 H. Con. Res. 390: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 391: Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
 H. Con. Res. 392: Mr. HONDA and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H. Con. Res. 396: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WU, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H. Con. Res. 406: Mr. NEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H. Res. 103: Mr. FILNER.
 H. Res. 129: Mr. CROWLEY.
 H. Res. 363: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H. Res. 402: Mr. RAHALL.
 H. Res. 470: Mr. CARDOZA.
 H. Res. 556: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Res. 570: Mr. NEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WEINER, Ms. MAJETTE, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
 H. Res. 575: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

74. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Jamin Potamkin, a Citizen of Pennsylvania, relative to petitioning the United States Congress for redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

75. Also, a petition of the City Council of Gulfport, Mississippi, relative to a Resolution supporting the President of the United States and his proposed amendment to the United States Constitution prohibiting same sex marriages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

76. Also, a petition of the City Council of Berea, Ohio, relative to Resolution No. 2004-13 supporting the Federal Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act of 2003; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2844

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT No. 1: In section 26(b)(2) of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as proposed to be added by the bill, strike "45 days" and insert "75 days".

H.R. 2844

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT No. 2: In section 26(b) of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as proposed to be added by the bill, add at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) EXTENSION OF DEADLINE TO PERMIT STATES TO HOLD PRIMARIES.—If State law provides that the candidates for a special general election held under this subsection are to be selected in a primary election, the State may extend the deadlines referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3) to take into account the period provided under State law for holding such a primary election, including any runoff election resulting from such a primary election."

H.R. 2844

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT No. 3: Amend paragraph (3) of section 26(b) of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as proposed to be added by the bill, to read as follows:

"(3) ELIGIBILITY OF CANDIDATES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A candidate shall be eligible to run in a special election held in a State under this subsection if the candidate meets such requirements as may apply under State law.

"(B) EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR ELECTION.—A State may extend the deadline provided under paragraph (2) for a special election to the extent the State considers necessary to prepare balloting materials and distribute absentee ballots which include the names of all eligible candidates, and to otherwise ensure that all eligible candidates are given sufficient time to prepare for and participate in the election."

H.R. 2844

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT No. 4: In section 26(b) of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as proposed to be added by the bill, add at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect the application to special elections under this subsection of any of the following laws:

"(A) The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.).

"(B) The Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ee et seq.).

"(C) The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff et seq.).

"(D) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg et seq.).

"(E) The Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

"(F) The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.).

"(G) The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15301 et seq.)."

H.R. 2844

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT No. 5: Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF MEMBERS AGREEING TO BE ABSENT FROM JOINT SESSIONS AND JOINT MEETINGS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—For each of the events referred to in subsection (b), the Speaker and

the minority leader of the House of Representatives shall each designate 25 Members who will agree not to be present at the event.

(b) EVENTS DESCRIBED.—The events referred to in this subsection are as follows:

(1) Any joint session of the 2 Houses of Congress held for purposes of receiving a

communication from the President, counting the votes of electors for the President and Vice President, or any other purpose.

(2) Any joint meeting of the 2 Houses of Congress held for purposes of receiving addresses from foreign dignitaries or any other purpose.

(3) The inauguration of the President and Vice President.

(4) Any other event for which the Speaker and minority leader determine that the designation of Members pursuant to this section will promote the continuity of the operations of the House in case extraordinary circumstances occur.